

THE
CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW.

N^o LXXXIX. OCTOBER 1897.

ART. I.—THE PLANTING OF THE ENGLISH
CHURCH.

1. *The Mission of St. Augustine to England* according to the Original Documents, being a Handbook for the Thirteenth Centenary. Edited by A. J. MASON, D.D., Canon of Canterbury and Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge. (Cambridge, 1897.)
2. *Chapters of Early English Church History*. By WILLIAM BRIGHT, D.D., Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford. Third Edition, revised and enlarged. With a map. (Oxford, 1897.)
3. *Beginnings of the English Church and Kingdom*. Explained to the People. By T. MOORE, M.A., Rector of St. Michael, Paternoster Royal, London. (London, 1897.)

THE place was Canterbury. The planter was Augustine. The seed was the Word of God, and He has given it increase, a hundredfold. It has taken root and filled the land. This is the historical fact which has been not unworthily celebrated at a distance of 1,300 years. It is not for us to describe or to estimate the value of the services of dignified ceremonial, the pilgrimages to places of historical or legendary interest, or the miscellaneous kinds of gatherings which have been arranged to celebrate the anniversary of St. Augustine's arrival. That lies within the province of the recorders of news, and even perhaps of the compilers of history. It must be sufficient here to say that a very general attempt appears to have been made throughout the Church of England to call attention to our spiritual fathers who begat us, from

VOL. XLV.—NO. LXXXIX.

B

370648

the little country churches where the S.P.C.K. cartoon of St. Augustine before King Ethelbert was placed in the porch and explained from the pulpit, to the mother church of Canterbury, where the ninety-third Archbishop addressed the prelates of the Lambeth Conference from St. Augustine's chair. Our duty is to review the literature which perpetuates the memory and establishes the claims of our spiritual ancestors, and without at all wishing to disparage what has been done in the way of special commemorative services, we feel bound to award the palm to what has been written, because we are very proud of the work of our Church historians. Mr. Plummer's edition of the historical works of Bede, as we noticed last October, appeared just in time to prepare us for the intelligent observance of the festival, and it is a pleasure to see that the high value which we then set upon Mr. Plummer's book is endorsed both by Dr. Bright in his new edition and by Canon Mason. Dr. Bright congratulates

'all who are interested in our national Church history on the appearance of an edition of Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica* together with his *Historia Abbatum* and his *Epistola ad Egbertum*, by the Rev. Charles Plummer, Fellow of Corpus Christi College. His two volumes will be found indispensable for the serious study of these "fontal" documents; and one may perhaps wish that he could have included the *Vita Cuthberti* within the scope of his most opportune publication' (p. vii).

Canon Mason, whose volume from the Cambridge Press is indebted to Oxford scholars for some useful help, expresses his gratitude to Mr. Plummer 'for his admirable edition of Bede's historical works, with the wealth of well-digested learning set forth in its notes;' and he adds, 'in using it, my only ungratified wish has been that sometimes Mr. Plummer would have translated, or at least have commented upon, a bit of Papal Latin which from his silence he evidently understands when others do not' (p. xv). Dr. Bright's new edition and Canon Mason's handbook were passing through their final stages at the same time. Dr. Bright 'had the advantage of reading some of the proof-sheets of the' handbook (p. ix), and criticizes points in two of the dissertations. Canon Mason mentions the fact that a new edition of the *Chapters* 'is in the press,' though the references to that work in his volume are necessarily to the second edition, for example on p. 236. He places it, among modern works, side by side with Dr. Stanley's *Memorials of Canterbury*, and speaks of the two as 'works of singular

beauty and charm in their various ways' (p. xv)—a description which is just and appropriate of the work of the earlier Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History, but which is hardly exhaustive, to speak very mildly, as applied to the solidity and fulness of the *Chapters*.

Canon Mason's handbook, with which we shall first deal, was compiled by the desire of Archbishop Benson, who sketched out what kind of book he wished to be prepared. According to his design it was to be published from the press of his own University, to contain a complete collection of authentic documents bearing on the coming of St. Augustine, with Latin and English close beside each other, with footnotes, with geographical and hydrographical results, with a small collection of terse essays, free from party statements, showing the real bearing of the events on later controversy (p. v). We have no general qualifications to append to the expression of our opinion that Canon Mason and his colleagues have loyally obeyed the spirit as well as the letter of the late Archbishop's injunctions, and have let facts speak for themselves in all simplicity. When we have to criticize special points, we hope that this unreserved general approval will be borne in mind. Our chief objection to the book indeed does not concern the execution of its plan, but the plan itself. A handbook, of course, may serve a purpose for which a larger book is useless. But the picture of a body of bishops, or other ecclesiastical tourists, rushing down to the cradle of English Christianity with Bradshaws in one hand and Canon Mason's handbook in the other, is, we would fain hope, only a humorous exercise of the imagination. Nor is there any danger that the clergy in these days will so neglect their duty to their bicycles or their golf links by bestowing too much attention upon the folios of ecclesiastical history, that Canon Mason need allure them from the complete works of ancient authors and offer them tempting little morsels in such a convenient form. Canon Mason himself, we are sure, would look upon the publication of his handbook as a real misfortune if it should lead anyone to rest content with it when he had intended, before he fell captive to the blandishments of its brevity, to begin the serious study of Bede's works under the guidance of Mr. Plummer and Dr. Bright. We fear, we confess, lest the walls of theological colleges and what are called the studies in clergymen's houses should become familiar with the easy-going saying that 'Mason's book will do,' without the serious study of larger works. We may do some good by saying at

once very frankly that it will not do. There is no royal road of arriving at a settlement of the controversy whether Augustine was or was not the apostle of England. The question cannot be settled by three or four maps and charts, a few dissertations, and the perusal of the short original passages which describe the work of his life. It must be determined by a full study of the growth of the work which he began, by an examination of the work of others, whose labours were independent of Canterbury, and by the habitual exercise of impartiality, born of studious attention to conflicting facts. On these grounds we assert that the study of Bede himself in full, under competent guidance, remains profoundly necessary for all who are to teach to others the facts of the foundation of English Christianity. We say this to guard against the misuse of what is really an excellent handbook. In his preface (pp. v-xvi) the editor tells the short story of his work of compilation, and says all that is necessary about his authorities. 'All that is known concerning the Gregorian mission which founded the Church of England is contained in the documents given in this book' (p. v). Gregory and Bede are practically the only two original authorities. We have the Epistles of the great Pope, and a few stray phrases in his other works, bearing upon the subject. The only letter on which a doubt has been cast is the important reply to St. Augustine's questions. It is sufficient here to say that Canon Mason gives all the facts, and concludes, as we believe upon perfectly adequate grounds, both internal and external, that we have in this reply a genuine sample of Gregory's administration (pp. viii-ix).

To show more fully the value of Bede's authority, Canon Mason prints the passage from the preface to King Ceolwulf, in which Bede tells us how he acquired his facts (pp. x-xiii). With regard to the most reverend abbot Esi who told Bede about East Anglia, we regret that Canon Mason can only repeat Mr. Plummer's lament that 'nothing appears to be known of him'¹ (p. xii). In speaking of the later authorities, an opportunity is taken of pointing out that the Chronicle of William Thorn of St. Augustine's Abbey is superior to that of Thomas Elmham, who wrote a generation later and adds nothing to the value of his predecessor's narrative (p. xiv). Both the Bishop of Oxford and Mr. Plummer are thanked for having looked over a large part of the proof-sheets (p. xvi). A useful chronological table makes mention of the chief incidents from the accession of Ethelbert to Wilfrid's sojourn

¹ Plummer's *Bede*, ii. 3.

in
(p
(fo
th
Pl
Th
of
his
as
ha
du
beg
pas
boo
the
of
con
ecc
sion
and
wit
Au
ded
incl
mar
thro
Tha
Chr
to E
and
spea
long
tells
to S
Greg
the m
mem
of ecc
1
ber 7,
refer
care o
groun
from
Cante
first s

in Sussex (pp. xviii-xix), there are a brief table of contents (p. xvii), maps of Western Europe and of England in 597 (following p. 160), and a chart of the west coast of Kent in the sixth century (p. 234), but there is no index, though Mr. Plummer has in this respect set such an excellent example. The effect of this is that we have to look through 160 pages of 'documents relating to the mission of St. Augustine and his companions' (pp. 1-159), forming the bulk of the book, as best we may, without help from the editor. This is, for a handbook, too much to expect from many readers. It is our duty, however, to examine the documents in question. They begin with Bede's account of Gregory, and proceed with such passages as are apposite from Bede's second, third, and fourth books down to the death of Deusdedit, the last archbishop of the Augustinian succession, and the immediate predecessor of the great Theodore. The story of Augustine's arrival, the conversion of Ethelbert, the reinforcements from Rome, the ecclesiastical buildings of Canterbury,¹ the Northumbrian mission, the relations of the Saxon Christians with the Britons, and the work in East Anglia, are the chief topics which fall within the period of the first six archbishops of Canterbury--Augustine, Laurence, Mellitus, Justus, Honorius, and Deusdedit. Two of the gems of Bede's collection of stories are included, the 'traditional belief' about the slaves in the market at Rome (p. 14), and the simile of the sparrow flitting through the lighted room in the story of the Northumbrian Thane (p. 131). One short extract is made from Thorn's Chronicle, which adds the dedication of St. Pancras's Church to Bede's account of the founding of Canterbury Cathedral and St. Augustine's Abbey (p. 93). Dr. Bright (pp. 61-2) speaks of this little church as one of the old British churches, long paganized and then restored to Christian use, and he tells us why the memory of the Roman boy-martyr was dear to St. Augustine. The extracts from the Epistles of St. Gregory show what a vast amount of care he bestowed upon the mission, and this is all the more remarkable when we remember that the Pope was holding in his hands the threads of ecclesiastical affairs in every realm in Christendom, that he

¹ The author of a scholarly special article in the *Times* of September 7, 1897, on the origin of Canterbury School pleads with conclusive reference to original authorities for the existence of a school under the care of the archbishops from Augustine downwards, and draws a well-grounded inference that the school at Canterbury 'may claim continuity from the era of Ethelbert to the era of Victoria.' This would make Canterbury not only 'the first seat of English Christianity,' but also 'the first seat of English education.'

was ill, and that he was worried by political anxieties.¹ We see how he formed more than one plan for the conversion of the English (p. 17), how he persevered when other hearts were failing (p. 21), how carefully he furnished the missionaries with commendatory letters, seven in number (pp. 23-35), how he wrote either to encourage the new converts or to warn the missionaries of new dangers (pp. 44-66), how he replied with patience in what is rather a little book (Pref. p. ix) than a letter to those questions of Augustine (p. 67), which bear such traces of an earlier life of monastic seclusion, how he sent reinforcements and rich supplies of the products of Western art and literature (p. 83), with yet another batch of commendatory letters (p. 87), a very noble scheme of ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and some wise advice on the treatment of heathen temples (p. 88).² We may add that the style of Gregory's Latin compares very favourably with that of many ecclesiastical scribes. It is not one of his letters that Canon Mason has to call 'super-papal in the convolutions of its style' (p. 121).³ At the beginning of this selection of documents Canon Mason appropriately places the words which St. Augustine sang as he approached Canterbury (p. xx), and at the end the enactment of the council of Clovesho in A.D. 747, which provides that the name 'of our blessed father and teacher Augustine' shall follow the mention of Gregory's name in the singing of the Litany (p. 160). What Archbishop Benson would have said of these 160 pages we cannot now know. For our part the chief defect of this portion of Canon Mason's work seems to lie in the fewness and shortness of the 'footnotes,' which the Archbishop expressly included in his design. We greatly object to the accumulation of long footnotes which have but a remote bearing upon the text which they profess to illustrate, and it would be unreasonable to expect the compilers even of a scholarly handbook to provide such enjoyment for their

¹ See Dr. Hodgkin's *Italy and her Invaders*, v. 391. It is a pity that Canon Mason has not referred to the whole of Dr. Hodgkin's masterly 'Life' of Gregory (*ib.* v. 279-453), if only to point out that there is much more value in Bede's chapter on Gregory than Dr. Hodgkin recognizes. See the *Church Quarterly Review*, No. 82, p. 553, No. 85, p. 117.

² Mr. Plummer has two fruitful notes on this and kindred subjects. *Bede*, ii. 58-9.

³ The contributors to the handbook seem to have been somewhat worried by the peculiar styles of Latin composition which have come before them. Lower down (p. 227) Professor Hughes finds the words of Orosius 'not easy to translate,' and speaks of 'the perverseness of a style which is that of Tacitus gone mad.' A third instance (Pref. p. xv) has already been quoted.

readers as is to be found in the apposite notes of the *Chapters of Early English Church History* and Mr. Plummer's edition of Bede. We also must bear in mind the strictly limited purpose of the handbook. But when all this has been said we regret to be obliged to say that many good opportunities of appending useful footnotes have been missed. In some cases nothing is said when much information is desirable, nor is a reference given to places where that information may be found. In other cases where we have looked for further discussion upon topics which earlier writers have left in an uncertain state, it has not been forthcoming. There should of course have been a note on the word 'indiction' on p. 17, or a reference to the notes of others,¹ and the inadequate note appended to the name of Queen Brunichild on p. 33 would not convey to an uninformed reader a true conception of the difficulty which is formed by Gregory's letters to her. We want more, too, on the title of Bretwalda (p. 36), and a note on p. 46 which tells us that 'the pall was an honorary compliment, and not a mark of jurisdiction' seems to us to be very questionable, even if we are to understand the remark to apply only to the case of the Bishop of Autun, to whom the letter is addressed, when we take the conclusion of the epistle into account. And in view of Gregory's own words about the pall (p. 79) of the Bishop of Arles, the meaning of the note ought to have been made unmistakable.² The letter of warning to Augustine, that he should not be unduly exalted by the great things which he had done, requires a note on the readiness of that age to see miraculous agencies at work in the lives of those whose work was favoured with the divine blessing. These, doubtless, are small points, but what are we to say when we find that there is no word of explanation at all appended to 'Augustine's Oak' in the text? (p. 95). It is true that a note just below informs us that the Huicci 'occupied roughly speaking our present Worcestershire,' though this does not give a very accurate impression of what Bede understood by Huiccian territory.³ But from Canon Mason's silence, and from the fact that Aust on the Severn and Augustine's Oak are assumed to be identical in the map which follows p. 160 the reader can learn nothing of the true difficulties of the problem. No effort is made by Canon Mason to reconcile the charter of Ethelred, which supports

¹ Plummer, ii. 38; Bright, p. 48.

² Mr. Wilson refers to the subject at some length in its general bearings in the last dissertation, p. 247.

³ See Bright, p. 497.

Aust, with the statement of Bede that it was on the confines of the Hwiccians and the West Saxons. Mr. Plummer himself has not quite grasped the geographical problem, for he holds that Aust 'suits Bede's description and the conditions of the case fairly well' (ii. 74). But the fact is that Bede's language requires a more easterly spot than Aust for the Oak, as Dr. Bright shows (pp. 85, 497). It is perhaps of less importance to the purpose of the handbook where we locate the spot at which Paulinus baptized on the banks of the Trent, but there is hardly room for a reasonable doubt that it was either Littleborough or Torksey. Canon Mason remarks that 'the place cannot now be identified with certainty' (p. 139), and ignores the extreme pains which have at length reduced the possible sites to two in number. The note on the village near Catterick where James the deacon lived (p. 149) is very little better. We rejoice to see such an eminent student of Bede mentioned as the new Bishop of Bristol, but he would hardly thank Canon Mason for quoting his authority for a remark which is at least as old as the time of Gale, and also, we believe, erroneous.¹ The note on the date of St. Augustine's death is fuller but still incomplete (pp. 103-4).² In making these criticisms we have in view the benefits which Canon Mason might have conferred on those readers who have not larger and fuller works at their command. We do not at all wish to criticize for criticism's sake, and therefore we will not dwell in detail on those occasions on which Canon Mason, not, we think, in the direction of improvement, has departed from Mr. Plummer's spelling or punctuation (p. xvi). We may not like to see Erpwald and Eadbald for the more usual forms Eorpwald and Eadbald (pp. 122, 152), but such a slight variation from custom is of little consequence. There is a note on p. 140 which contains, if not a trace of party spirit, at least the material for its exercise. It is difficult to see what good end was served, to say nothing of the ostensible purpose of the handbook, by branding the papal author of the letter to Edwin as 'the unfortunate Honorius, who was anathematized after his death by the Roman Church for maintaining the Monothelite heresy.' The Pope who sent a pall to Paulinus deserved a better distinguishing epithet than that. The four dissertations which are appended to the volume come much more nearly up to the standard of the Archbishop's design, as we understand it, than the annotations of the documents. Five dissertations were originally pro-

¹ See Bright, pp. xii, 150.

² Plummer, ii. 81; Bright, p. 105.

pose
a su
relat
diss
Mr.
land
the
toug
usef
that
mad
may
wor
baro
esta
king
his
sert
dela
peac
Sax
sunk
lugu
who
the
seco
very
Aug
in t
writ
a co
mak
conc
we c
hazy
that
its is
that
tiani
Aug
ing c

1
of re
p. ix)
2

posed, but Professor Collins was prevented, we regret to see, by a sudden illness from preparing his essay on the pre-Norman relations between England and Rome (p. xvi).¹ In the first dissertation, on the political outlook of Europe in A.D. 597, Mr. Oman, of *All Souls'*, shows how the conversion of England takes its place in the general history of Europe among the many developments of Gregory's energy (p. 161). He is touched by 'two main emotions' when he has made his useful survey—admiration for Gregory (p. 171), and a feeling that the turning back of the Lombards from Rome in 593 made way for the mission of St. Augustine (p. 172). We may note with wonder the manifold results of Gregory's soft words to King Agilulf, how his influence benefited the Lombard race, how he postponed for twelve hundred years the establishment of Rome as the capital of a united Italian kingdom, and cleared a path for the peaceful departure of his missionary band. We gather also from Mr. Oman's dissertation fresh conceptions of the Divine wisdom, which delayed the execution of Gregory's plan until comparative peace had succeeded to the shoutings of the British and Saxon captains, and the tumults of passion had at all events sunk into that smouldering hatred which is described in 'the lugubrious pages of Gildas . . . that Celtic Jeremiah,' to whom 'the idea that anything could or should be done for the Saxon would have been unthinkable' (p. 182). In the second dissertation Canon Mason himself undertakes the very delicate task of estimating the value of the mission of Augustine and his companions in relation to other agencies in the conversion of England (p. 184).² He has evidently written from a genuine desire to do justice to all the facts of a complex matter, and has perhaps been at more pains to make just remarks about each agency than to reach judicial conclusions about their bearing upon one another. When we consider all his observations together we are left with a hazy conception of his final judgment, and an impression that he has rather played round the subject than determined its issues. He is in one passage clear enough on the point that 'the Christianity which first held Britain—the Christianity of St. David and St. Dubric, who were alive when Augustine came—had no appreciable influence in the founding of the English Church' (p. 185). And again, 'While . . .

¹ We are glad to see that Mr. Moore's book has had the advantage of revision from Professor Collins in several important sections (Pref. p. ix).

² Moore, *Beginnings*, p. 261.

the Church in the Celtic parts of southern Britain is much older than Augustine's time, it did not contribute, so far as history is aware, to the foundation of that which is, properly speaking, the English Church' (*ibid.*) Nothing shows that the monks of Hy had attempted to preach the Gospel to the English before 597, and we know that Bertha had only not prejudiced her husband against her religion (pp. 185-7). If Augustine's successful work was confined within narrow limits, it was at all events a fine record for seven years. Kent 'was soon almost wholly Christian,' Laurence was consecrated as his successor, and bishops placed at Rochester and London; so that Canon Mason can say 'the work was not widespread, but nevertheless the Church of England was well founded before Augustine died' (p. 191). He also pays a just tribute to the 'six years of noble energy' when 'Northumbria was all on fire with Christian enthusiasm' because of the preaching of Paulinus (p. 194),¹ as we rejoiced to remember a few weeks ago when we stood in the crypt of York Minster and looked upon the veritable remains of his Saxon church.² An important statement follows in regard to Aidan's later work.³ Canon Mason says that

'if it had not been for the remembrance of Paulinus the fire would not have caught so quickly or spread so wide. The paganism which Paulinus found there had not recovered strength to resist Aidan. Even in the region of which Aidan was most directly the Apostle [we know where that phrase comes from], Aidan built largely upon another man's foundation. The Gregorian mission must be credited with giving an abiding impetus to the Christianization of Northumbria' (p. 195).

But then a few pages further on Aidan has his turn, and Canon Mason declares that, 'unquestionably, Aidan and his disciples had a much larger share in the original conversion of England than Augustine and his disciples' (p. 203). 'Nevertheless,' he adds, 'the history of the Church of England begins with Augustine and centres round [*sic*] his see of Canterbury,' or as we may say, if for the sake of vividness we may borrow from the story of Columbus, nothing can dislodge the fact that Augustine chipped the egg before the Saxon king. 'Some share,' too, in the conversion of East

¹ Moore, *Beginnings*, p. 19.

² In a letter to the *Times* of August 24, 1897, on the church of St. Ethelburga at Lyminge, mention is made of this 'Saxon church, which finally developed into York Minster.' There are points in the letter which expose it to criticism; but it is worth reading, because Queen Ethelburga was one of the early links between York and Kent.

³ Moore, *Beginnings*, p. 38.

Angl
Nort
that
the
West
of C
rity
was
Mero
and
Only
claim
Bonie
Engl
their
bega
histo
of S
in sh
to th
noth
to w
we w
and
just
along

I
inqu
easy
exce
be re
of E
grap
in a
H. A
relat
alwa
along
were
bert
Mart
of G
of M
tine's

Anglia must be assigned to Canterbury (p. 195), but, 'besides Northumbria and East Anglia, it would be difficult to prove that the Gregorian mission in Kent directly contributed to the evangelization of any other part of England' (p. 196). Wessex began its Christian story in deliberate independence of Canterbury, and passed for the first time under its authority when Theodore consecrated Leutharius (pp. 197-8). It was the same mighty organizer who, by translating Chad to Mercia and consecrating Erconwald for London, drew Essex and the Midlands into subjection to Canterbury (pp. 199-201). Only a 'small share' of the conversion of Sussex can be claimed by the Gregorian mission (p. 202), and in fact, when Boniface of Dunwich died, in the year that Theodore reached England, the Augustinian line of bishops died out. But their works followed them; and if 'English Church history began a new chapter under Theodore . . . the form of that history was already dictated by the successes of the mission of St. Augustine' (p. 205). Canon Mason has no difficulty in showing, and indeed shows very well, that to acknowledge to the full our obligations to Gregory and to Augustine has nothing to do with submission to papal claims of jurisdiction to which Gregory himself was a stranger (pp. 205-8). But we wish that he had not called Gregory our apostle (p. 208), and that he had made it a little clearer why Aidan has no just claim to that title, which truly belongs to Augustine alone.

In the third dissertation Professor Hughes makes a careful inquiry into the landing place of Augustine (p. 209), and it is easy to follow his argument by means of the accompanying excellent map (p. 234). There are conflicting statements to be reconciled; and when Professor Hughes abandons the site of Ebbsfleet and inclines towards Richborough, he has to grapple with some difficulties which are set forth by Dr. Bright in a new note (p. ix). The fourth dissertation, by the Rev. H. A. Wilson, contains notes on some liturgical questions relating to the mission of St. Augustine (p. 235).¹ Bede is always making liturgical allusions, and in regard to Augustine alone many interesting topics arise. The litanies which were sung as the company of missionaries approached Ethelbert and as they entered Canterbury, the worship at St. Martin's, the early service books of England—with a notice of Gregory's advice about the formation of a *fasciculum*, and of Mr. Martin Rule's theory about the *Missal of St. Augustine's Abbey*, which he has recently edited—the peculiarities

¹ Moore, *Beginnings*, p. 250.

of Gallican and British rites, the original form and the gradually acquired significance of the pall, are branches of the subject which afford plenty of scope to Mr. Wilson, both for the employment of his own abundant literary resources and for showing how much still remains to be done in liturgical fields of study. He will see that Dr. Bright has commented upon one topic of his dissertation.¹ We lay down the handbook, not indeed with the conviction that it is 'a most precious little book,' as the Archbishop described his ideal (p. v), but recognizing that such selections, like Mayor and Lumby's fragmentary edition of Bede, have a certain value of their own, and serve a useful if a limited purpose. If only vigour and fulness could have been poured into the notes, the book would have been more worthy of the great occasion which called for its publication.

We now proceed to devote our attention more particularly to the *Chapters of Early English Church History*. This work, as our readers are aware, although it has never formed the subject of an article in our pages, is not a handbook, but a well-filled storehouse of information, which, with Mr. Plummer's work, sheds wellnigh as much light as is forthcoming on the text of Bede's history and the early history of Christianity in England. The first edition appeared in 1878,² and the second, revised and enlarged, in 1888.³ There was no new preface to the second edition needed, and in our Short Notice upon it we observed that Dr. Bright was able on all important matters, and in the vast majority of details, to maintain his first conclusions without change. The volume was indeed increased by the addition of sixteen pages, the whole was carefully revised, misprints were corrected, some old notes were amplified, on some points new notes were introduced, a few touches of still riper scholarship adorned the text, and the most recent points of controversy received characteristic notice; but the book remained substantially the same. The appearance of the third edition, after a slightly less interval than that which elapsed between the two earlier editions, but after a period of increased interest in the history of the Church of England, and of much serious historical research, raises the question how far this substantial character of the book is still maintained, and in what respects it is changed in detail. We may say at once, what our readers will expect to hear, that twenty years of study have not led Dr. Bright to change the judgment which he pronounced in his first edition in any

¹ Bright, p. x.

² *The Church Quarterly Review*, No. 11, p. 237.

³ *Ibid.* No. 55, p. 228.

cruci
and
sions
of tw
peri
the c
work
the
of W
high
aban
ing
Eng
stum
when
form
know
look
state
ackn
But
add
betw
seco
that
new
mar
the
impr
of a
soon
editi
thir
and
The
Mr.
Cane
at a
the
as I
how

1
mast
their
251 (

crucial matter. He has not had to eat any of his own words, and if this was a testimony to the soundness of his conclusions after the lapse of ten years, it is doubly so after the lapse of twenty years. How many of us in the course of the same period have uttered language and adopted arguments about the old British Church, about Augustine, about the value of the work of Paulinus, about the Irish and Scottish missions, about the subsidiary benefits of our connexion with the civilization of Western Europe, about the character of Wilfrid and the high policy of Theodore, which we have modified or totally abandoned when we knew better and were capable of forming a maturer judgment. And many a student of early English Church history knows that when he has been stumbling in the darkness and has wandered from the way, when he has been misled by party statements, and misinformed by those who will not go to the primary sources of knowledge, he has got back to the way of historical truth by looking up to the steady light of Dr. Bright's well-balanced statements and following their guidance.¹ This is simply to acknowledge an experience for which many are thankful. But there are some new features in the third edition which add much to the work, which make a greater difference between the third and second editions than between the second and the first, and which will lead every student to feel that he must bring his bookshelves up to date by placing the new edition upon them. We will describe the distinctive marks of the new edition to our readers. The Delegates of the Clarendon Press may be congratulated, not only upon an improved appearance of the binding, but upon the adoption of a darker tint for the cover, which is not likely to fade so soon—an objection to which their selection for the earlier editions was singularly open. We have a new preface to the third edition, from which we learn that the map of England and Wales in about A.D. 700—that is, just after the death of Theodore in 690—has been prepared as the frontispiece with Mr. Oman's assistance (p. vii). By comparing this with Canon Mason's map of England in 597 (p. 160) we can see at a glance how 'the English Bishoprics are identical with the kingdoms, except in the cases of Kent and East Anglia,' as Dr. Bright observes in the corner of his map; and also how much had been achieved when Theodore's administrative

¹ Some of Arnold's boys have consecrated the lofty lessons of their master to the service of the Church, and in their turn have recalled to their own pupils the lines on Rugby Chapel. M. Arnold, *Poems*, i. 246, 251 (ed. 1877).

genius had done its work upon the materials which Augustine and the other labourers of the Gospel had put into his hands. Dr. Bright's map will be an incalculable boon to the young students who are new to the subject of his book, and it seems to be open to improvement in only a few minor points. No obviously consistent principle has been followed with regard to the ancient and modern name of the same place. There are instances in which the ancient name is given first, with the modern name in brackets, and *vice versa*; and other instances in which an ancient name alone is given, or again a modern name alone. Thus we have Streonshalch (Whitby), Ad Barve (Barton), Adgefvin (Yevering)—a misprint for Adgefrin—but Doncaster (Campodunum). Then again we have Carlisle without the expected Lugubalia in brackets, Peterborough without Medeshamstede, and Sidnacester without the alternative name of Stow, which has no serious rival. The dot for Tiovfingacæster is placed on the Torksey side of the Trent, whereas, as we shall see, Dr. Bright adheres to its identification with Littleborough. The little pair of crossed swords which are used in modern maps to denote the site of a battle appear in the case of Heavenfield and Maserfield, but not Hatfield. Winwaedfield is not marked at all, and with good reason doubtless, for although there is not sufficient ground for setting a passage of Nennius against the known meaning which Bede attached to the region of Loidis, we cannot be quite sure whether the Winwaed is the Aire or the Went, and so cannot fix the site of this battle with certainty, in spite of its historical importance (pp. 202-3). The same spirit of caution, the mark of the true scholar, has doubtless led to the omission of Augustine's Oak. The quotation of a lively expression about a Welsh synod as being a 'reverberation' of the proceedings of St. German, which Dr. Bright introduced into his notes, has led him to pay an eloquent tribute to its author. We quote it here as a sample of faithful friendship, and of the style of writing which has enabled Dr. Bright to translate the biographies of Bede into English with an added charm. We are glad, too, of the opportunity which is thus afforded to us of paying our own respectful tribute to its subject, and we hope that the passage will not escape notice if an occasion should arise for the compilation of a biographical memoir of one who was 'worthy of all honour.' Dr. Bright says:—

'The phrase "the present Bishop of St. David's" (p. 35) is now no longer applicable to Bishop Basil Jones. One who was formerly associated with him as a brother-Fellow in University College may

be p
of t
ledge
since
a qu
work
stater
from
men
men
ever
the p

I
his h
to s
are s
his r
surp
secti
In t
rema
Rev.
only
(pp.
with
mode
us of
treat
local
164-
Shiel
year
which
groun
tion
not h
occup
near
really
coura
fidelit
a lon
exam
claim

be permitted to recall, with grateful respect, the signal combination of the unfailing kindness of a friend with the full and exact knowledge of a great archæological scholar. Forty-one years have passed since, in co-operation with Edward Augustus Freeman, he published a quarto volume on *The History and Antiquities of St. David's*—a work which gave abundant promise of that habitual accuracy in statement and steady balance of judgment which were inseparable from his deep affection for the ancient Church of the Cymry. Few men ever had such aptitude for bringing English and Welsh Churchmen to understand and sympathize with each other; and no man ever did more for that good end than he during his long tenure of the primary Welsh bishopric' (pp. vii-viii).

Dr. Bright has always brought the text and the notes of his historical works well up to date, and we are not surprised to see that references to Mr. Plummer and Bishop Browne are scattered all over the pages of the third edition. But in his race with time on the present occasion Dr. Bright has surpassed himself by adding a long note to the preface in four sections, after the rest of the edition had been sent to the press. In the first section of this note he comments upon some remarks in the two dissertations of Professor Hughes and the Rev. H. A. Wilson, which we have already noticed, although only the proof-sheets were at hand when Dr. Bright wrote (pp. ix-x); and in the remaining three sections he deals with several of those local pleas for the identification of modern places with ancient historical incidents which remind us of St. Aidan's zeal for the Celtic Easter,¹ while Dr. Bright's treatment of these aspirants for the honour of their own localities is quite in Bede's own gentle manner (pp. x-xii, 164-5). One of these is a claim that St. Hilda's, South Shields, is the site of the nunnery where Hilda passed one year of her life before she became abbess of Hartlepool, which Dr. Bright finds to be untenable, both on chronological grounds and also because he cannot reconcile Bede's description of the place with it (pp. x-xi; 310). Mr. Plummer does not help us on the point. Another section of the new note is occupied with the etymology of Akeburgh, the 'township' near Catterick where James the deacon displayed such 'a really noble instance, in the third rank of the ministry, of courageous steadfastness under exceptional trial, and simple fidelity to a sacred trust' (pp. xii, 150). The remaining, and a longer, section shows how carefully Dr. Bright has re-examined his own conclusions and scrutinized some re-stated claims about Tiovulfingacæster (pp. xi-xii, 140-1). The

¹ Bede, iii. 3.

evidence that the 'formidably polysyllabic' and 'uncouth Saxon' name refers to the present Littleborough is too slender to allow Dr. Bright to speak very decisively in its favour in his text. The place, he says, 'may be conjecturally identified with Littleborough' (p. 141). But he speaks more decidedly in his later note, and states the case for Littleborough at its best. There are, however, several points which lessen the force of the argument upon us. It is known that Littleborough was called Segelocum by the Romans, and it is strange that this less uncouth name, which was probably known in Bede's time, was not used by him.¹ Again, if Littleborough was a place of any importance in Saxon times, or hallowed by the great scene of the baptisms by Paulinus, no Saxon trace of its importance remains, nor so far as we know was any step ever taken in the Anglo-Saxon Church of later times to commemorate that earlier scene. In travelling from York Paulinus, if he journeyed by road, would appear from the map to have reached the banks of the Trent a few miles further north than Littleborough, though Littleborough was the place where the road crossed. If we turn to the claims of Torksey, we find a place connected with the river Trent, the stream Till,² and the Fosdyke water, which from its natural features would form an impregnable fortress for the sons of Tiowulf. We do not attach much value to the attempt to show that the Till was called the Tiovil by producing the local proverb 'It's nobbut a Tiowillian,' used when a trivial thing is to be described, and meaning it is only like the little Till as compared with the broad Trent. But we can understand that the place would be such as to catch the eye of the military genius of the Romans, and of the Danish general Tork. The place was one of much dignity and influence in Saxon times, and the importance of its ecclesiastical buildings points to some notable occurrence which was commemorated by their erection. If we reflect upon the extraordinary genius for water-way construction which led the Romans to connect the Trent with the Witham by the Fosdyke water, and the consummate skill by which the water of both rivers is made to flow into that canal, and if we remember that barges were freely used for transit in Saxon times, we shall understand that it is quite possible that Paulinus journeyed from York or Lincoln by water. That

¹ *Bede*, ii. 16.

² There is another Till, in Northumbria, into which the Beaumont water flows. Plummer's *Bede*, ii. 105.

is
of t
it w
by r
all l
can
Litt
Tio
com
form
of th
recti
mad
print
third
text
enum
addi
is su
whic
more
terist
of the
Colum
epith
note
Adam
to Co
small
have
when
since
author
the to
which
Rome
said
But o
menti
will f
quote
enlarg
crease

is a suggestion which does not seem to have occurred to any of the commentators on this passage of Bede's history, and it would require considerable readjustment of the evidence, by no means unfavourable to the claims of Torksey. When all has been said, however, and even if the case of Torksey can be stated as skilfully as Dr. Bright has stated that of Littleborough, we cannot say that we feel sure of the site of Tiouulfingacæster.

After these notes depending upon the new preface, we come to the fourteen chapters which, in number as before, form the body of the new edition. A careful examination of this and the second edition shows that many slight corrections and enlargements, chiefly in the notes, have been made. This has resulted in the addition of a few pages of print to almost every chapter, so that in the aggregate the third edition contains thirty-eight more pages of annotated text than the second. It would be almost impossible to enumerate all the matters of importance which have by these additions received fuller illustration, nor is it necessary. It is sufficient to say that many of them are small emendations which have been made in order to make a passage a still more faithful rendering of an original document. A characteristic instance of this improvement is to be found in one of the notes on the love of animals among the saints, in which Columba's white horse is mentioned (p. 306, note 5), the epithet 'old,' which appeared in the second edition (p. 279, note 4), being erased in deference to the exact text of Adamnan.¹ The addition to the same note of a reference to Columban's love for squirrels is an instance of numerous small enrichments which have been supplied, and which have a special interest and value of their own, especially when they emphasize convictions which have grown stronger since the previous edition, and give us glimpses of the author's inner mind. This is the case with an addition to the text on p. 222, where the Roman love of domination, which seems to have infected Wilfrid during his stay in Rome, before the council of Whitby, is, in the new edition, said to have been 'already too congenial to its bishops.' But of course there are weightier additions which must be mentioned if we are to establish our contention that students will find it necessary to provide themselves with and to quote from the latest edition of the work. We must only enlarge upon one specimen of this class, and it refers to the increased vigour and confidence with which Dr. Bright hews in

¹ Adamnan's *Life of Columba*, iii. 23.

pieces all theories which tend to dim the unique fame of St. Augustine as the planter of the English Church. This is brought before us in the very opening words of the new preface, when Dr. Bright speaks of 'sending forth this enlarged edition during the "thirteenth centenary" of the arrival of St. Augustine in England and therefore of the foundation of "the Church of the English"'" (p. vii). In the survey of the life and work of St. Augustine, on pp. 107-9, there are a few small corrections made, a modifying phrase struck out so that a more general sense is given to a sentence of appreciation, and the addition of a sentence of much significance, 'In this sense, as the first preacher to men of their race, he had been their "apostle."'" This will do something, we trust, to exterminate the influence of an unhappy epigram¹ which concealed the worthlessness of its history beneath the genius which its author had displayed in other fields of learning, one of those unfortunate remarks of which another instance is given on p. 498, with the comment that 'criticism would here be superfluous for any one who knows the facts, and has read Bede.' The passage which describes how 'the English Church, which had been founded and organized without the aid of the British, absorbed the latter into its own body' (p. 112) stands as it did before, as does the well-known summary in the retrospect, so far as the text is concerned, and which we quote both because of its own value, and because Dr. Bright has been able to enforce its truth in a new footnote by the high authority of Bishop Browne. Our national

'conversion, it is obvious to remark, involves the formation of a new "Church of the English," not the development or extension of the "ancient British Church." The English Church did not grow out of the British; the missionaries who brought the Saxon or Anglian tribes into the fellowship of Christ's kingdom were men from the Continent, or men of Irish race, or Englishmen like Cedd or Wilfrid; they were in no instance "Britons" or "Welshmen." Long after the conversion was completed, the "British" Christians held aloof from the "Saxon" Christians; it was but by degrees during the next centuries that they conformed to the "Catholic Easter," and entered into fellowship with the younger and stronger Church.

¹ Comp. p. 160 n. Aidan 'cannot with any thing like historical exactness be called "Apostle of England";' see also p. 497 and the author's *Waymarks in Church History*, p. 307. But the epithet once given has been widely circulated, and we have just met with it in the Baird Lecture for 1895, where it is used by a Professor of Church History among the Presbyterians, who have their own reasons for being grateful to the author of the phrase. *The Influence of the Scottish Church in Christendom*, by H. Cowan, D.D. (A. and C. Black: London, 1896), p. 12.

It
lan
per
An
(p.
We
tha
Gla
had

Not
the
whi
hav
and
con
edit
Fac
like
of a
said
exar
the
500)
prec
or t
the
allus
para
of th
made
been
refer
exec
se) D
less
Chur
by th
taken

¹ I
dimit
bisho
Mr. P
is a sh
² M
³ I

It is necessary to state this in plain words, because of the inaccurate language which has often obscured the facts under the influence, perhaps, of a strong preconception, controversial or "patriotic." And these facts, for history's sake, must be kept distinctly in view' (p. 481).

We may add to that, still in the interests of historical balance, that we should like to think that all the bishops who met at Glastonbury, and cherish the memory of its beautiful legends, had read this passage over again.

The chief addition which is made to the 'Additional Notes' is a passage in Note C, p. 489, upon the question of the so-called completion by Theodore of Chad's consecration,¹ which is illustrated by an interesting view which appears to have obtained for a time in the Roman communion. Here and there, too, there are little modifications such as 'hardly conceivable' (p. 496) for the 'inconceivable' of p. 457 (2nd edition) in the criticism upon the late Lord Selborne's *Ancient Facts and Fictions*. One of the few places where we should like to make an addition to a note is in Note F, on the growth of a parochial system.² Something more might have been said upon that growth in other parts of the Church, for example, in Alexandria in the time of St. Chrysostom.³ In the miscellaneous notes included under Note G (pp. 496-500), the chief changes are an omission of a note on the imprecations of Irish ecclesiastics (p. 459, 2nd edit.), and one or two short additions, the most interesting of which, after the controversial importance of a few points to which allusion has already been made, is a passage on the 'incomparable charm' of Glastonbury (p. 500). The useful addition of the name of the kingdom to which they refer has been made to the genealogical tables (p. 504), and the index has been reconstructed, doubled in size, and made to include references to the chief materials contained in the notes. In executing this part of his work (*qui facit per alium facit per se*) Dr. Bright has accepted assistance from a friend, doubtless one of those numerous pupils to whom he has made Church history live again, and whom he has then surprised by thanking them for the interest which they naturally have taken in it (p. vi, 1st edit.; pp. vi, vii, 3rd edit.)

¹ In the text on this matter Dr. Bright now renders 'episcopatum dimittere' by 'lay aside the episcopate' (p. 260) instead of 'resign the bishopric' (1st edit. p. 227, 2nd edit. p. 236), probably in deference to Mr. Plummer's criticism, ii. 206, where Mr. Plummer's reference to p. 228 is a slight slip.

² Moore, *Beginnings*, pp. 86-106.

³ Dean Stephens's *Life of St. Chrysostom*, p. 103, n. 2.

We, too, feel alive to the enjoyment of Bede's story, and realize the need of spreading its details on all possible occasions and in all possible directions. Mr. Moore's book is one of many attempts which are being made at the present time to put the *Beginnings of the English Church and Kingdom* before the people. The organizers of Church Defence are incessantly urging upon clerical and lay teachers alike the duty of telling what the Church is and what the main incidents in her life have been. For some time past the diocesan higher religious education schemes and some pupil teachers' examinations have included Church history in their syllabus, and this has broadened slowly down into the prize examination schemes for children until we reach the threshold of the inclusion of Church history in the ordinary diocesan syllabus for children in all schools. A concurrent stream has diffused interest in the matter among older people. The parish magazines have conveyed accurate, if sometimes rather dryly-worded, details of local Church history; lists of incumbents, reaching it may be continuously back, far behind the Reformation, have found their way into church porches; guilds and classes have been instructed with a comparative fullness which is quite remarkable upon many periods of Church history; popular lectures with lantern illustrations have been delivered on tour by competent if somewhat too controversial lecturers. Mr. Moore himself speaks a little too much in a controversial tone, but we do not know where we are to go for a better list of subjects. Not only are the chief facts in the first two centuries of the life of the English Church included, but also information on a large number of general Church affairs is given, such as church building, burials, woman's influence, uses of parish churches, early attempts to educate and elevate the people, early English Christian democracy, guilds, the relation of the Church to labour and land, tithes, the parochial system, property and patronage, poetry and music, the privilege of sanctuary, and slavery. He breaks up the continuous history into sections, and we must very highly commend his plan of inserting, under each section in the table of contents, special references to such standard authorities as Bede's *History* and the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, and to such standard writers as Green, Freeman, Stubbs, Bright, Plummer, and Bishop Browne, who is still called the Bishop of Stepney (pp. xi-xxvi). We do not propose to criticize Mr. Moore's materials very closely. It is enough to say that to our mind the value of his book lies largely in the fact that he has pointed out how standard works of refer-

enc
go
go
in
is
han
by
M
is
oug
che

bef
for
pos
of
arr
fir
of
the
mer
of
Pra
des
chis
imp
som
pra
this
Chu
cho
Day
Day
the
Gos
from
cha
Epl
mys

1
'thin
of th
the h
sibil
this

ence may be employed in popular teaching. If we were to go further we should have to offer detailed criticism upon a good many passages, and we prefer to express our approval in general terms. We must say, however, that five shillings is a prohibitive price for thousands of people into whose hands we should like to put a book of this kind. It was not by publishing a five shilling edition that a million copies of *Merrie England* were sold, and if we believe that the Church is charged to deliver the message of true merriment we ought to publish popular books on Church history at the cheapest possible prices.

We would fain plead, with these three historical works before us, for the teaching of Church history in a popular form in the elementary schools.¹ Far be it from us to propose an additional subject to an already overburdened staff of teachers. What we rather wish to plead for is a better arrangement of the subjects which are taught already. The first need is to gather together the many scattered fragments of instruction on the subject of the Church, and to make them the basis of the history proposed. The Old Testament teaching on the Temple, the meaning of the kingdom of God in the New Testament and especially in the Lord's Prayer, the clause about the Church in the Creed, and the description of the Church's life in the last part of the Catechism, are topics on which all Church teachers endeavour to impart definite instruction. It is possible, we believe, to do something towards grouping these matters together in a practical way. Thursday morning is the suitable day for this lesson on the Church, the day on which the King of the Church ascended into heaven. The morning hymn will be chosen to harmonize with this fact, the Collect for Ascension Day and perhaps for Saints Simon and Jude or All Saints' Day will be used, and the passage of Holy Scripture read in the course of prayers will be chosen either from St. Matthew's Gospel, because there our Lord's royalty is emphasized, or from the Acts of the Apostles as being a divinely inspired chapter of Church history, or from the Epistle to the Ephesians because we find there St. Paul's description of the mystical body of Christ and enter into the heart of his

¹ The bishops at the Lambeth Conference in their encyclical letter 'think it necessary to call attention to the misleading character of many of the statements to be found in those school "Readers" which touch on the history of the Church, and . . . recommend those on whom responsibility rests to take such steps as they can to secure a truer handling of this important subject.'

Christology in its bearing upon the society of the redeemed, or from the Revelation of St. John as being so full of pictures and images—always dear to children—of the Bride of the Lamb. All this will not occupy fifteen minutes, but it will prepare the clergyman, the teaching staff, and the children, for the ensuing lesson on that Kingdom which is not of this world. The majority of children, and, it may be added, the average members of a popular audience, do not easily enter into any scheme of chronological sequence. A more vivid method of arrangement must be employed for the lessons if anything in the nature of a course be decided upon. A useful plan is to group the facts under the heads of the Church at large, the diocese, and the parish. Whitsuntide will naturally be chosen, as the birthday of the Church, for the first of a course of lessons on the Church as a Catholic whole, its nature, its divine life, its faith and Creeds, its government, its orders of ministers with their functions and apparel, its worship and its formularies. Under each of these heads short and delightful stories from Church history spring in profusion from the well-stored mind, and children will enter into the account of the martyrdom of Ignatius and Polycarp, the Eucharist in the Catacombs, the scene at Nicaea, the election of St. Ambrose, the conversion of St. Augustine, the cloak of St. Martin, the cell of St. Jerome, and the vivid pictures in the lives of Saints Athanasius, Basil, and Chrysostom. The ordinary school maps will be quite sufficient to show how the Church spread from Jerusalem to the utmost parts of the earth. For the diocesan history, the time of the annual confirmation, when the Bishop is really seen, or, at all events, talked about, is the natural starting point. The children who see him, his vestments, his staff, perhaps his mitre, connect him with the saints in the windows, the stone figures on the tombs, or the pictures which have been shown to them. This opens the way for lessons on diocesan history and lets in the stories of Gregory and Augustine, the work of Theodore, the life of Bede, and the black-letter saints of local interest, and especially the history of the diocese, its mother church, its chief bishops, and places of note. Only the parochial history remains, which may be taught in more detail. A series of lessons on the parish church, given, it may be, in the sacred building itself, will suitably start from the date of the dedication festival. The series will include a careful account of private benefactions of ground, fabric, furniture, and endowment, a history of the building, lessons on the churchyard, porch, font, bells, nave,

cha
of
oth
whi
for
of
tre
chil
go,

add
pri
ans
mo
ing
add
the
a F
firs
frie
the
to
exp
ture
or
fere
am
stro
St.
they
Brig
bee
on
befo
in t
nun
Brig
visi
Lar
was
(Se
mor

1
for

chancel, sanctuary, altar, organ, vestments, clergy (the titles of rector, vicar, &c.), churchwardens, sexton, sidesmen, and other parts and terms of the church.¹ The standard works which we have passed under review afford copious materials for any number of lessons, and Mr. Moore's *Beginnings* is one of the books which will show how to cast the stores of these treasure houses into a serviceable form. Let us train up the children of the Church of England in the way they should go, and when they are old they will not depart from it.

A word or two may be added upon Cardinal Vaughan's address at Ramsgate, delivered, after the above words were in print, on September 13, 1897, and published with a crushing answer in a leading article in the *Times* on the following morning. Cardinal Vaughan was at his best as a clever, ingenious special pleader. The historical omissions of the address, and the peculiar light in which the speaker regarded the facts to which he did allude are quite remarkable, even for a Roman Catholic controversialist. To take the last point first, it is only in the minds of Cardinal Vaughan and his friends, and not at all in the mind of any single member of the Church of England who took part in the Anglican visit to Ebbsfleet or in the Lambeth Conference, so far as our experience goes, that anything in the way of 'a new departure' was made when St. Augustine's memory was honoured, or when the thirty-fourth resolution of the Lambeth Conference emphasized 'the divine purpose of visible unity amongst Christians as a fact of revelation.' A very long and strong list of passages could be quoted which do honour to St. Augustine from writers who love his name as much as they hate Popery. It must be sufficient here to say that Dr. Bright's tribute to the first Archbishop of Canterbury has been in print for twenty years, and expresses what his belief on the subject was for probably more than twenty years before that. And the view of St. Augustine which is taken in the English Church has been gained, in the case of a vast number of teachers of English Church History, from Dr. Bright's lecture-room and writings. As for the question of visible unity, passing by the fact that the resolution of the Lambeth Conference stated such a well-known truth that it was called 'a platitude' in a leading article in the *Standard* (September 14, 1897), there are few points which have been more clearly set forth by standard Anglican divines than this.

¹ The *spirit* of these lessons is to be found in *The Christian Year* for Trinity Sunday, and in Isaac Williams's *The Cathedral*.

It is a little late in the day to call Butler's Analogy 'a new departure,' and yet there is to be found one of the most luminous statements of the truth.¹ A whole collection of passages and references is given by Palmer,² in a book which Cardinal Newman, as a Roman Catholic, described in very high terms.³ We have by our side a list of Anglican authorities in manuscript on the subject far too long to print here. In fact, any educated Anglican recognises that the truth is 'as old as the hills.'

We must refer to the other feature of Cardinal Vaughan's address which we noticed—his suggestive omissions. Probably his historical parallel between 597 and 1897 will strike the imagination of the average Englishman more than any other part of his address, but it is not really of much value. St. Augustine was Archbishop of Canterbury, and so is Dr. Temple, but Cardinal Vaughan is not; he was not committed to the doctrines of the immaculate conception or the papal infallibility as being *de fide*, nor is Dr. Temple; but Cardinal Vaughan is bound by both. St. Gregory repudiated the title of 'universal bishop' in 597, but there is no sign of Pope Leo doing anything of the kind in 1897. St. Augustine duly administered the Sacraments of the Gospel and recited the Nicene Creed, and Dr. Temple claims to do the like—which, after all, is more important than the use of holy water and one or two of the other trivial points which enter into Cardinal Vaughan's parallel. Yet how little does the address contain about these really important points of agreement which illustrate the continuity between the first and the ninety-third Primate of All England. We only have space and time to mention the heads of some of Cardinal Vaughan's far reaching omissions: such as (1) his silence upon the independent action of Theodore and the way in which the whole Anglo-Saxon Church and nation ignored Roman interference in the case of Wilfrid; (2) the numerous instances of pre-Reformation struggles against papal usurpations; (3) the damaging evidence of such facts as the schismatical action of the Romanists in England in the eleventh year of Queen Elizabeth's reign; and (4) the unaltered repugnance of the whole body of Anglican clergy and faithful laity—emphasized by the instant condemnation of any approach to the recognition of Roman jurisdiction, spiritual or otherwise, on the part of individuals—against any papal interference whatever

¹ Pt. ii. c. i. p. 151 (ed. Oxf. 1844).

² *A Treatise on the Church of Christ*, i. 22-9.

³ *Apologia pro vita sua*, chap. ii. p. 65 (ed. London, 1887).

with
seek
Vaug
anno
(Sep
quite
that

AR
Cypr

A DE
rema
secut
menc
which
its ad
high
learn
whole
pate.
that i
Dr. B
losing
routin
it wa
Cante
the fi
chapt
invest
journ
and it
who
equal
learn
Addi
officia
Cypr
becam
What
diary,

with the affairs of this Church and realm. If we were to seek for any feeling of satisfaction with regard to Cardinal Vaughan's address, we should find it in the reflection that the announcement of its proposed delivery led the *Daily Chronicle* (September 14, 1897), to print in a special leading article quite the best popular account of the early English Church that we have seen in a short form.

ART. II.—ARCHBISHOP BENSON'S 'CYPRIAN.'

Cyprian: his Life, his Times, his Work. By EDWARD WHITE BENSON, D.D., D.C.L., sometime Archbishop of Canterbury. (London, 1897.)

A DEEPLY pathetic interest attaches to the publication of this remarkable volume. Alike in its inception and in its prosecution, in the purpose with which it was originally commenced, and the unwearied perseverance against obstacles which might well have been deemed insuperable with which its accomplishment was persisted in, this book upholds the highest traditions of the English Church for scholarship and learning in a day when other cares too largely absorb the whole strength, bodily and mental, of the Anglican Episcopate. In a brief prefatory note the writer's son informs us that it was begun, on the advice of Bishop Lightfoot, when Dr. Benson, as head master of Wellington, 'felt the danger of losing sight of study, of erudition, of antiquity,' in the daily routine of professional work, and with the same lofty object it was continued in after years at Lincoln, at Truro, at Canterbury. Thirty years intervened between the writing of the first pages of 'copy' and the completion of the latest chapters, during which period every subsidiary point was investigated with conscientious minuteness, and a special journey was undertaken to study the topography of Carthage and its neighbourhood *in situ*. It is only the busiest of men who find leisure for such exhaustive treatment of a subject equally difficult and fascinating, and we are not surprised to learn that the papers on the Cyprian table at Truro and Addington often lay untouched for weeks together, that, official work carefully discharged, an hour was stolen for Cyprian late at night or at early morning, and that the book became the Primate's cherished, indeed his only, amusement. What it meant to him is seen in the brief extract from his diary, March 6, 1896: 'I pray God bless this Cyprian to the

good of His church. If He bless it not, I have spent half my life in building hay and stubble, and the fire must consume it. But, please God, may it last.'

We entertain no doubt that this fervent aspiration will be fulfilled. Unless we are seriously mistaken, Archbishop Benson's *Cyprian* will be a κτῆμα ἐς αἰón for the whole Anglican communion. His work bears throughout the stamp of the author's most fascinating personality, in the vividness of its historic imagination, in its rapid grasp of salient facts, in the ease with which it marshals the masses of learning at his command, in the wealth of illustration which quickens every page. Equally characteristic, too, are the thoroughness with which each incidental but important point is exhausted, and the singular self-repression which resists irresistible temptations to exultation and to scathing rebuke. The book itself, so essentially a labour of love, is no unqualified panegyric of its subject, and its discriminating disapprovals are the more impressive as coming from one whose lifelong admiration is expressed with singular delicacy of appreciation and keenness of insight, so that the great African prelate stands out in high relief with the startling realism of consummate portraiture. It is needless to dwell upon the exceptional qualifications which the Archbishop brought to his task, or to remind the reader that his conclusions are reached from the vantage ground of finished scholarship, of practical statesmanship, and of deep spiritual conviction.

In a graphic introductory chapter, 'Carthage and her Society,' as they existed in Cyprian's days, are set vividly before us. No spot in the whole Eastern hemisphere has experienced more stupendous alternations of fortune than the headland upon which, as it juts out from the shores of Africa into the very centre of the Mediterranean, there arose in successive ages Phœnician and Roman, Vandal and Byzantine, Carthage. With the destruction of Phœnician Carthage a whole civilization, in Michelet's words, passed away at a blow, like a fallen star; but a quarter of a century later her history began again, 'though in dreary fashion: ' and a real policy—which enriched vast classes, created a yeomanry and fed Italy—commenced when great men and statesmen, a Julius and an Octavius, governed the empire. Then once more Roman settlers thronged the city and overflowed into the adjacent territory, until sunny slope and fertile plain were thick with stately villas and busy towns. 'Horses and cattle, cereals, the heaviest wheat and largest yield then known, minerals, unique marbles, palm groves southward and olive

wood
the la
the c
(p. xx
colon
Berbe
vast
Carth
equall
The
with p
forum
moder
harbor
whose
for 'a
Whilst
the wo
A
zealous
son dw
organ
the ex
tenants
peasant
proprie
upon t
class of
and mo
of plea
outward
ments
Those
by Chr
study a
of it dr
in pass
jealousy
the ruin
solving
madness
sin, the

woods northward, and mountains of cedars studded and stored the land. The yield of oil was prodigious, and a third of all the corn consumed in Rome and Italy was grown here' (p. xxvi). Phœnician boatmen and Libyan peasants; Roman colonists, old soldiers and speculating farmers; bronzed Berbers, tall and proud, with superb gait and lithe as panthers; vast hosts of slaves elbowed one another in the streets of Carthage, whose population and wealth in Cyprian's day equalled that of Alexandria, and was second only to Rome. The beauty of the city equalled its rank. It was adorned with public buildings—theatre and amphitheatre—odeon and forum, temple and basilica—on a scale which dwarfs our modern public edifices, and it possessed inner and outer harbours, with spacious quays and massive ramparts, structures whose ruins have supplied quarries of tufa and marble for 'anti-Christian Tunis and supremely Christian Pisa.' Whilst within the walls, and for miles without them, stretched the woods and gardens of the Roman peers.

A dependency so rich and powerful was controlled with zealous precision by the Imperial government, and Dr. Benson dwells upon the completeness of the civil and military organization from the staff of the Proconsul downwards; upon the exactness with which the rights of ancient freeholders and tenants were maintained; upon the manifest desire to render peasant life at once compatible with the interests of Italian proprietors and tolerable to those who held under them; and upon the openings thus supplied for the services of a vast class of architects and engineers, of builders and road-makers, and more especially of lawyers, on the soil of 'Africa, nurse of pleaders.'¹ Yet this material and complex civilization, so outwardly fair and flourishing, included disintegrating elements which portended, if unchecked, irretrievable ruin. Those who would understand what civilized life, unleavened by Christian influence, really is—a subject well worthy of study at the present moment—should ponder the description of it drawn by the master-hand of Cyprian. We note only in passing as symptoms and causes of decay the Roman jealousy which repressed the growth of local martial spirit, the ruinous concentration of property in few hands, the dissolving force of immorality which poisoned the circus where madness was king, and made the theatre the apotheosis of sin, the fact that all life was pervaded by a sense of the

¹ See Juvenal, *Sat.* vii. 148:

Africa.' 'nutricula causicorum

unreality of God. Despite the existence of eminent and possibly numerous exceptions, the loftiest heathen philosophy had failed to raise the moral tone of society.

'The one thing,' says our author, 'desirable, the one thing unattainable by any known method, was a re-casting of Society such that selfishness should be discounted as an evil, the source of evil, and yet the individual be made of full account. A Society faithful to the Individual, the Individual devoted to the Society' (p. xxxvi).

That an influence was at work which, if it ever became dominant, would seriously impair the Imperial system of Rome, was already well known to the reigning powers, and was causing them considerable misgiving. The contemptuous tolerance of the government for alien religions was sternly and abruptly withheld from a creed which by forbidding its followers to practise the rites of the national cult, especially the worship of the reigning monarch, seemed to be tainted with treason and to be undermining the unity of the Empire. The jealousy of the Roman law about the holding of assemblies with supposed evil intent, was quickened by the absolute incapacity of the heathen mind to comprehend the real purpose of gatherings so simple as those for Christian worship. The withdrawal, so far as was practicable, of the believers from public life, especially from the army, every detail of which was inextricably blended with compromising ceremonies, not unnaturally rendered them odious to their fellow men. All these causes combined to develop an Imperial theory of persecution, and a popular demand for it which, in Dr. Benson's telling phrase, was perpetually simmering, and which broke out ever and anon with irresistible violence. The occurrence of national disaster, the failure of the corn supply, the visitation of the plague forthwith elicited the cry, 'Throw the Christians to the lions!'

Such was the position of the Church in the Roman Empire in the middle of the third century of our era, when Thascius Cyprian, 'the leading member of the highest of professions' in the city of Carthage—second only to Rome in wealth and importance—became a convert to Christianity. All that the influence of the peerage represents to us, all that commanding popular gifts can ensure in our day—leadership in society, abounding wealth, predominant authority—was then within the grasp of eloquence.

'To the well-moulded strength of Roman eloquence Africa had added a fervour not unlike that with which Ireland has enriched the English bar. With a powerful memory, and a methodic, classificatory mind, Cyprian had pursued the highest literary culture.

"What
Egypt
the lit
mere p
of the
like th
aside
draugh
majest
master

As
Dr. B
new c
of tru
life o
Ampl
richer
and a
by a c
to his
restrai
with v
perfect
deep s
could
The C
of his
for her

De
devoti
conspi
tian L
the wr
and of
labour
Idols
his mo
he cha
Life.
more t
is too
pure f
He is
think c

"What gold, what silver, what raiment he brought with him out of Egypt!" exclaims Augustine. And Jerome, treating the conquest of the literary world by Christianity as grander than any triumph over mere power or luxury, and seeking an instance of the true "Kings of the World," who are last of all to hear the word, yet at length, like the Ninevites, descend from their thrones to plebeian levels, lay aside the radiance of their eloquence, put away the intoxicating draught of words, and thenceforth content themselves with the majesty of Christian thoughts—selects the great Carthaginian master' (p. 3).

As we read in full detail, which we cannot reproduce here, Dr. Benson's description of the position and character of the new convert, we are deeply impressed with the divine force of truth which could have alone won over Cyprian to the life of the gospel of self-sacrifice and its attendant perils. Ample wealth, large estates, gardens (the special pride of the richer Carthaginians) of great extent and beauty; a winning and affectionate address and an expression made attractive by a certain grave joyousness; his dress quiet but suitable to his rank; his whole tone of thought at once lofty and restrained; his mind trained by legal study and furnished with wide literary culture, Cyprian presents to us the most perfect picture of a finished pagan gentleman. What but the deep sense of a heart 'so pained that it could not be at rest' could have led such a man to embrace and to avow the faith of The Crucified? A presbyter named Cæcilian was the means of his baptism into the Church of Carthage, already famous for her 'faith, organization, and quietude.'

Deepest study of Holy Scripture and determined self-devotion to holiness of life were the immediate and most conspicuous qualities of Cyprian the Catechumen. Of Christian Latin literature there was as yet but scanty supply; but the writings of Minucius Felix and Tertullian were available, and of the latter Cyprian became an eager disciple. His labours bore fruit in the production of his first exercise, 'That Idols are no Gods,'¹ which was followed shortly after by his monologue on 'The Grace of God,' in the first of which he challenged the world's *Credo*s, in the second the world's *Life*. We have no space for quotation from these treatises of more than a few lines. 'We cannot see God,' he writes, 'He is too bright for our vision; we cannot reach Him, He is too pure for our touch; we cannot appreciate (*æstimari*) Him, He is too great for our intelligence; and therefore we only think of Him worthily when we own Him to be beyond our

¹ *Quod idola*, § 9.

thought ; and herein is the height of guilt, to be unwilling to own while you cannot help knowing Him.' He has not yet grasped the truth that the Gospel can regenerate governments as well as individuals. 'Kingdoms,' he says, 'are not the result of desert, but are changed by chance.'

The treatise on the Grace of God presents a vivid picture of contemporary life, and insists on the only cure for inveterate and omnipresent evil that might well be deemed hopelessly incurable. For the supply of Baptismal grace is only limited by our desire for its bestowal. 'It flows on without stop, it flows over without stint. We have only to present to it a thirsting and opened breast ; what measure we bring thither of faith to hold, so much do we drink in of inflowing grace.'¹ And he proceeds to detail his own experience of the regenerating and enlightening change through which he had passed. 'As soon as I drank of the spirit from heaven and was restored to new manhood by a second nativity, then, marvellously doubts began to clear ; secrets revealed themselves ; the dark grew light ; seeming difficulties gave way, supposed impossibilities vanished' (p. 16). Such inward illumination was the reward of Cyprian's entire self-surrender to the sanctifying power of faith, of his self-dedication henceforth to purity of life and to charity, which gave with both hands of his wealth for the relief of the poor. For this purpose Cyprian sacrificed not only his farms, but his delightful gardens. The latter some friends bought in and insisted on his residing in them. The new conditions of the Church required a leader of special gifts for its guidance in the troubles impending over it, and Dr. Benson indicates the place which in God's overruling providence Cyprian was destined to fill.

'We need not,' he writes, 'look to him for Theology proper, for doctrinal refinement, for the metaphysic of Christian definition. We shall find him busy with moral conditions, the work of grace, the bonds of union : the sanctification of life through the sacraments, the remodelling of life through discipline ; the constitution of the Church in permanence, the transforming social influences which are to control the application of power and wealth, to charge science again with the love of truth, art with the love of beauty, and to create a new benevolence. The "Charismata of Administrations," "helps," "governments"²—these are his field' (p. 17).

These exceptional talents were to find abundant exercise in the episcopal chair of Carthage, to which Cyprian was consecrated on the death of Donatus, A.D. 248. The details of

¹ *Ad Donat.* § 5.

² 1 Cor. xii. 5, 28.

his
voice
bore
in C
warn
refus
futura
whom
own
It fu
elect
by th
of G
addr
own
with
Bish
B
Dr. F
section
of e
Soci
byter
of dis
cleric
which
for co
a nati
put
Dr. B
all su
indica
Dedu
same
not t
endow
The d
param
of tra
the B
Ordai
were "
name
reality
electio

his election and consecration are unknown, but the popular voice, which unanimously demanded his appointment, overbore the not unnatural opposition of presbyters who had 'been in Christ' long before him, and outweighed the apostolic warning against the elevation of a novice and his own earnest refusal of the proffered honour. If there were germs of future trouble in the mortification of the five presbyters to whom Cyprian was preferred, there was no misgiving in his own mind but that his title was absolutely valid and canonical. It fulfilled the three requisites then held to be essential, viz. election by the neighbouring bishops of the province, upheld by the suffrage of the Plebes, and confirmed by the judgment of God. It is worthy of notice that his episcopal style, when addressed by the Roman clergy and by the Confessors of his own city, was Pope of Carthage, a name at that date entirely withheld by the Roman and all other letter writers from the Bishop of Rome.

Before entering upon Cyprian's administration of his see, Dr. Benson discusses in two deeply suggestive and pregnant sections the view which Cyprian held of the origin and nature of episcopacy. As acknowledged chief of the Christian Society, as president of the 'separate semicircle of the presbyters,' as chief instructor in his Church, as principal arbiter of disputes, as judge in Christ's stead of morals and discipline, clerical or lay, did he hold that the bishop wielded authority which in theory belonged equally to all believers, but which for convenience sake was delegated to him as head priest by a nation of priests? 'Or did he regard his office' (we cannot put the alternative more clearly or concisely than in Dr. Benson's own words) 'as something different in kind from all such conceptions of it? As a line traced in the Divine Plan, indicated and assumed, if not defined, in the New Testament? Deducible from it by reasoning, such as evolves from the same writings the doctrine of the Holy Trinity? As a power not there reduced to terms, but constant in exercise; endowed with a grace specific, exclusive, efficient?' (p. 32) The distinction between these two alternatives is radical and paramount, and Cyprian's arbitrament is expressed in terms of transparent and indisputable conclusiveness. 'For him the Bishop is the sacrificing priest. Christ was Himself the Ordainer of the Jewish priesthood. The priests of that line were "our predecessors." The Jewish priesthood became "a name and a shade" on the day when it crucified Christ. Its reality passed on to the Christian bishop' (p. 33), whose election followed on the same lines, was subject to the same

moral conditions and is regulated by the precise laws enjoined by the Mosaic statutes for the Levitical priesthood. It is important to add first that Cyprian was not led to this conviction from the exigencies of his quarrel with the Novatianists, but that he held it from his 'novitiate'; and secondly, that in his episcopal capacity he felt bound to do nothing without the information and advice of presbyters, deacons, and laymen.

We cannot enlarge upon the degree in which Cyprian's view diverges from modern opinion and practice, nor discuss the several particulars—of which nine are enumerated—in which it differs from any scheme now current of the Christian ministry; but the paragraph which unfolds the origin and bearing of Cyprian's theory is at once too important and too characteristic to be passed over.

'Whence,' asks Dr. Benson, 'then, did this form of Christian thought originate? I see no proof, and to me it is incredible, that he or any other Africans should have derived any such scheme, consciously or unconsciously, from *Pagan* constitutions, which appeared to them all in the light of a purely demoniacal and satanic system. Nor yet is it possible that they inherited them from any *Judaizing* forms of Christianity. For not only is sacerdotalism not one of the characteristics for which Judaizers are ever reprehended, but in fact the very essence of Judaism lay in looking back to the literal circumcision, the literal passover, the literal centralising of the Church upon Jerusalem. Towards Gentile priests, towards Levites from the circumcision, they had no propension. Neither to heathensim nor to legalistic sects can we trace back the fruitful, powerful theory now accepted in Africa. Was it then but an unconscious straining, first of language, then of feeling, lastly of thought, which gradually warped with a hieratic distortion offices originally politic and didactic? Did the contemplative study of numerous fulfilled types draw men by a seemingly irresistible attraction to imagine an actual continuity, totally unreal, between a sacrificial priesthood and what was designed only for a hortatory college? Or, was the belief a legitimate development of the principles of the apostolic Church, parallel with and analogous to the growing light on cardinal doctrines which similarly nothing but use could illustrate? And are all the forms in which it may be said to live among us, broken lights of the same truth? The alternative is an important one. It will be answered by thinkers according to their schools, and cannot be determined by history alone' (pp. 40-1).

Whatever his theory on the origin of his office, Cyprian soon found its administration so arduous as to tax his patience to the uttermost. With the thirty-eight years' peace innumerable abuses had crept into the Church, and the ministry, which called loudly for and would strenuously resist

reformation
main
intrig
exam
our r
the c
taint
the c
abjur
other
the v
to ins
heret
becom
thes
shock
at var
the p
in the
Dress
chief
wome
Christ
Roma
and p
load
antim
toes ti
demea
Cypria
of his
ing sa
arouse
had be
Wi
which
Benson
the E
issue o
against
first ins
many o
did Cy
retreat
stricken
VOL.

reform. How could purity of life and effective discipline be maintained against the opposition of a worldly laity and an intriguing clergy whose moral standard was lowered by evil example and by contact with defiling influences of which our modern life supplies no conception. So wide-spread was the corruption that the African episcopate itself was terribly tainted. Not only were there bishops who had pressed into the office for the sake of its emoluments, and were ready to abjure at the first appearance of danger; but there were others of character so fraudulent and immoral as to be on the verge of excommunication, and others again too ignorant to instruct their catechumens, or too heedless to abstain from heretical prayers. Under such superintendence what could become of the presbyterate and the laity? Side by side with these profligate and corrupting forces there had sprung up a shocking fanaticism, such as has swept in intermittent waves at various epochs over some sections of the Church, and under the profession of the highest spiritual purity has eventuated in the most scandalous excesses. In his treatise upon *The Dress of the Virgins*, Cyprian went to the root of the mischief by endeavouring to purify and exalt the influence of women on the community. Through what gradual stages the Christian virgins of Carthage passed from 'fashions half-Roman, half-Tyrian, the neck buried in masses of gold chain and pearls, the hair piled in grape-like clusters, arms and feet loaded with bracelets, the almond-like eye outlined with antimony, cheeks "dyed with crimson falsehood," fingers and toes tipped with henna' (p. 56), to the modesty of dress and demeanour which become consecrated lives, is illustrated in Cyprian's pages, as are also their exceptional trials at the time of his accession to the episcopate. Nothing humanly speaking save the cleansing fires of persecution could avail to arouse and purify a Church whose divinely delivered discipline had been corrupted and whose faith was half asleep.

Without entering upon the Roman theory of persecution, which has been more fully elaborated since Archbishop's Benson's pages on it were written, it may suffice to say that the Emperor's rescript had the force of law, and on the issue of that by Decius (in the latter half of the year A.D. 249) against the Christians, the attack became general. In the first instance its severity was chiefly aimed at the bishops, many of whom headed the list of martyrs, whilst others, as did Cyprian, believed it to be their duty to withdraw to a safe retreat, from whence they could guide and control their stricken flocks. Never did the fires of persecution burn more

fiercely; no cruelty, no indignity—neither the Lupanaria nor the torture-claw—was spared to tender maiden or aged manhood. Never did the faith which overcometh the world win more glorious palms of victory. But during thirty-eight years of undisturbed peace numbers had joined the Church who could not face so stern a trial, and the defections might be counted by thousands. Some openly apostatized and denied their Lord. Others gave a modified submission to save wife and children the horrors of the torture-chamber. Others purchased from friendly and conniving officials the *libellus* or authoritative recognition of acts of heathen worship which its holder had not actually performed. In Rome, in Alexandria, in Carthage, the Church reeled beneath the blows which fell, rapid and accurate, upon it. Fabian, Bishop of Rome, was amongst the earlier victims, as were also the patriarchs of Antioch and Jerusalem. Origen was tortured to the utmost limits of human endurance. Dionysius of Alexandria, Gregory Thaumaturgus, Cyprian, were in concealment. When remorse seized upon and agonized the lapsed; when confessors and martyrs pleaded for or absolved those who had yielded and were perhaps personally dear to them; when presbyters and deacons, swayed by varied motives, inclined to more lenient or more vigorous decisions; when one confessor, jealous for his Lord's honour, would have cut off the lapsed irrevocably, and another in the name of the All-merciful, would have restored them to communion with undue precipitation, the rightful determination of the precise discipline to be insisted on called for the soundest and most discriminating judgment. It was essential that it should be settled not on uncertain and local practice, but on universal and divinely appointed principles. The question of the Lapsed became the question of the Church throughout the world.

Yet its decision, eventually determined by Cyprian's energy and penetration, was for the moment imperilled by a faction raised at Carthage against their absent bishop, and supported under erroneous information by the Christians at Rome. Cyprian's position was one of exceptional delicacy when from his own secure retreat he enjoined on his clergy the duty of abiding at their posts and calmly but unhesitatingly upheld the episcopal authority so essential in this hour of trial. His absence from the seat of peril could easily be misinterpreted, and the five presbyters who had opposed his election soon found in it a confirmation of their doubts. The glamour surrounding rash exposure of life fascinates human nature, and both then and since there were some who held

tha
Th
tho
bef
per
+ th
imp
not
mai
fere
indu
spe
Chu
aggr

at C
fully
less
Rom
repu
adop
her c
Cyp
as fo

had
assem
perse
for th
indivi
diaco
requir
stance
hands
and to
death
be re
presby
resolu
Confes
to the
in thei
them v
martyr
Christ
they w
the co

that the first duty of Cyprian's life was to throw it away. The authority of a bishop, whose absence might plausibly, though unfairly, be attributed to timidity, was likely to wane before that of confessors who stood resolutely in front of peril. How few persons would realize at such a crisis that 'the presence of a bishop on any one spot was infinitely less important than uninterrupted government, and that it was not the martyrdom of a saint which was in question, but the maintenance of rule' (p. 85). Between the Scylla of Indifferentism bidding for popular support with newly invented indulgences, and the Charybdis of Puritanism armed with specious ideals, it needed the ripest statesmanship to steer the Church along her path, and to repel even well-intentioned aggression on the independence of its several dioceses.

How admirably Cyprian dealt with the laxity of Novatus at Carthage and the excessive severity of Novatian at Rome, is fully expounded in Dr. Benson's pages, nor is his exposure less complete of the modern Ultramontane pretensions, that Roman supremacy decided an issue arrived at after the repudiation of Roman interference, and finally settled by the adoption of a policy which Carthage originated, and which at her desire was adopted by Rome. The course advocated by Cyprian for the pressing urgency of the moment is described as follows:

'To preserve the cases of the Lapsed intact, whether the martyrs had given them Letters of Peace or not, until councils of bishops, assembling both at Carthage and at Rome on the abatement of persecution, should lay down some general principles of restoration for those who deserved compassion: then the cases to be heard individually by the bishops with the assistance of their presbyterate, diaconate, and "commons:" full confession without reserve to be required in the presence of those most conversant with the circumstances: readmission to communion to be given by the imposed hands of the bishop and clerus: meantime to concede to mercy and to the martyrs thus much—that any Lapsed person in danger of death or in serious trouble, *who had been provided with a Libel*, might be readmitted to communion with imposition of hands by any presbyter, or in desperate cases even by a deacon: until general resolutions shall have been come to, all others, who had not obtained Confessors' Letters, must even in the hour of death be commended to the forgiveness of God without earthly communion and be assisted in their repentance. It was not for the ordinary officers to restore them without directions from the bishop, or recommendation from martyrs. To all it was still open publicly to recant their denial of Christ, and to abide the issue from the heathen authorities. Thus they would be not merely restored but crowned. The grounds of the course he advised were these:

'1. That so general a question should be dealt with upon some general principle, not by individual discretion.

'2. That the Lapsed if restored at once would have fared better than the Constant who had borne the loss of all things.

'3. That some regard should be had to the "prerogative" of Confessorship' (pp. 96-7).

The principles laid down by Cyprian have been very recently condemned in unmeasured language, but it would have been more to the purpose if his critics, instead of indulging in vague and sweeping assertion, had pointed out the distinct errors involved in his teaching and had indicated the course which he ought to have pursued. The treatment of the Lapsed and of those who, under various pretexts arising from its discussion, had set up bishop against bishop and altar against altar, was one which urgently demanded decision based upon right lines of ecclesiastical discipline and a correct grasp of Scriptural doctrine concerning the unity of the Church. Were those lines as traced by Cyprian erroneous, or was he blamable for insisting upon any exercise of discipline and for not letting the African Church of the third century anticipate the chaos of Anglican Christianity at the close of the nineteenth? Did Cyprian arrogate to himself undue authority and wield it in an imperious autocratic spirit? Did he set up a false standard of judgment by which to determine which was the true Church amidst the conflicting claims by which native laity and foreign Churches were then distracted, or was he wrong in his efforts to maintain unbroken that outward and visible union on which the Apostles had insisted, and for which their Master in His most solemn hour had prayed? In his day Christians had not yet learned to regard the Divine command to report sin to the Church with its accompanying warning against disregard of Church censure as being, shall we say, at least in abeyance, or to hold that Church unity, the emblem and copy of the Divine, was reasonably typified by innumerable sects or that the maintenance of Church growth could best be promoted by fissiparous propagation. Under the conditions existing in his day was it malignant or mischievous or misleading to assert that 'the Bishop is in the Church and the Church in the Bishop, and that if any be not with the Bishop he is not in the Church: or that the Church is not separated nor divided; but is in truth connected and joined together by the cement of bishops mutually cleaving to each other'?¹

For as then there was no question about the Divine

¹ *Epist.* lxxi. § 7.

origin of episcopacy, so there could be no doubt about the constitutional spirit (to use a modern phrase) in which Cyprian wielded its powers. 'From the beginning of my episcopacy,' he wrote to his clergy, 'I determined to do nothing of my own private judgment without your advice and the concurrence of the people.'¹ Whilst firmly upholding the Bishop's authority, it was with the persuasion that it concerned not a few, nor one Church, nor one province, but the whole world. And he held it becoming to the modesty and discipline and character of the entire Christian community, that the Bishops meeting with the clergy and in the presence of the laity who stand fast, to whom also, for their faith and fear, honour is to be shown, may settle all things with the due reverence of common consultation.² He repeats the same assertion in a score of other letters, and reiterates the gentleness of his own administration.

'The Church here,' he writes two years later, 'is not closed against any, nor the Bishop denied to any. Our patience and easiness and kindness are open to all who come. I wish all to return to the Church; I wish all our fellow-soldiers to be enclosed within the camp of Christ and the dwelling-place of God the Father. I forgive everything; I overlook many things, through my desire and longing to unite the brotherhood together. Even the sins which are committed against God I do not weigh with the full strictness of religion. I am almost myself a delinquent in remitting delinquencies more than I ought. I welcome with ready and entire affection those that return in penitence, who confess their sin, making humble and genuine amends.'³

While such abundant testimony to the personal character of Cyprian must be held conclusive, the deeper question still remains to be considered, whether the great Carthaginian administrator was justified in his assertions concerning the origin and scope of episcopal authority. Once more we must recall, at the risk of some repetition, the reader's attention to the position of the Church and its rulers which elicited Cyprian's numerous letters and his treatises on *The Lapsed* and *The Unity of the Church*.

The moment of Cyprian's elevation to the episcopate was, as has been shown, the eve of an unforeseen but perilous crisis. With the long peace enjoyed by the Church much laxity had crept within its fold, which the persecution of Decius revealed in startling defections. Church government and discipline became the problem of the hour. How were the Lapsed to be dealt with? What degree of authority was

¹ *Epist.* xiv.² *Ibid.* xix.³ *Ibid.* lix. § 22.

to be conceded to faithful martyrs and confessors? Where was the ultimate jurisdiction for the determination of discordant opinions? Did the Church possess disciplinary power for the reconciliation of its own penitents, and, if so, in whom was it vested? Or was irremediable confusion the mournful but inevitable result of such a trial, so that amidst undoubted holiness of life, and with identical teaching, it could be content to see altar against altar, chair against chair? To such questions Cyprian gave a clear and unhesitating reply. He first pointed out the special danger of the age, viz. that old error was being insidiously presented under Christian forms, and then continues—we give the passage, slightly condensed, from Dr. Benson's rendering—as follows:

'Such danger can be detected only by distinct conceptions as to the abode of truth, clearness as to the Scriptural idea of unity. These are not far to seek. When the Lord gave Peter his commission, "Whatsoever *thou* shalt bind shall be bound," and then renewed the commission to *all* the Apostles, "Whosoever sins *ye* remit they are remitted," it is obvious that He placed all alike on the same level; yet, by first addressing Peter alone, He indicated the Oneness or Unity of the commission itself. So, ever since, this tangible bond of the Church's unity is her one united episcopate, an Apostleship universal yet only one—the authority of every bishop perfect in itself and independent, yet not forming with all the others a mere agglomeration of powers, but being a tenure upon a totality, like that of a shareholder in some joint property. . . . The episcopate, above all, is bound to exert itself in the maintenance of its own individual oneness.

'Then follows the famous and beautiful passage on the natural analogies of this spiritual unity. "There is one Church which outspreads itself into a multitude [of Churches], wider and wider in ever-increasing fruitfulness; just as the sun has many rays but one only light, and a tree many branches yet one only heart, based in the clinging root; and while many rills flow off from a single fountain-head, although a multiplicity of waters is seen streaming away in diverse directions from the bounty of its abundant overflow, yet unity is preserved in the head-spring. Pluck a ray away from the sun's body! Unity admits no division of light. Break a bough off a tree! once broken it will bud no more. Cut a rill off from the spring! the rill cut off dries up. So too the Church, flooded with the light of the Lord, flings rays over the whole world. Yet it is one light which diffuses itself everywhere: the unity of the body knows no partition. She reaches forth her boughs over the universal earth in the richness of her fertility, broadens ever more widely her bounteous flowing rivers, and still there is one head, one source, one mother, rich in ever succeeding births. Of her we are born, her milk our nurture, her breath our life"' (pp. 182-3).

We must resist the temptation to quote at greater length the examples with which Cyprian illustrates and enforces this unity. He sees it typified in the Ark of the Flood, in the Seamless Robe, in the one House untouched in the fall of Jericho, in the one House of the Paschal Lamb. Its spirit is exemplified by the dove-like form and nature, by the harmony which maketh 'men to be of one mind in the house' of Israel. It is deducible from the Unity of the Godhead, and is not only enjoined by St. Paul and St. John, but even more emphatically by Christ Himself. It is in direct antagonism to separatism, which is the offspring of heresy, presumption, and self-will. It is the outward and visible sign of the mysterious union betwixt Christ and His Church, whose members are the sons of His undefiled spouse; so that he cannot have God for his father who has not the Church for his mother. It is the touchstone of heresy and the condition of vitality, and 'schism is more fatal than lapsing; and even the schismatic's death under persecution is no martyrdom, only a penalty and a despair' (p. 184). Its violation is to be traced, not to the theory of any teachers, but to the influence of an age 'of recognized, sanctioned, recommended selfishness—selfishness which saps belief and moral force together, which undermines that faith whereon rest the principles of God-fearing, righteousness, love, and hard work, and diminishes the awe of things to come' (p. 185).

'This,' adds the Archbishop in his terse, piquant manner, 'was penetrating doctrine; went to the heart of things. Which of the Churches will master it earliest? The suitability of the whole argument to the crisis, and its effectiveness, need no illustration. The beauty of its diction is a fit vehicle for the loving holiness and might of its spirit. It searches alike the deeps of the Divine Word and of the human heart. Again and again its persuasions and its warnings have availed with spirits nobler than the noblest, which have agonized themselves into separations—yea, and in hours of greater temptations than theirs' (pp. 185-6).

With a passing glance at the defects of Cyprian's theory and the impossibility of harmonizing it with some phenomena of Church history, Dr. Benson proceeds to discuss two questions of urgent moment. 1. Whether Cyprian was an expounder or an inventor of the oneness of the Church. 2. Whether Roman supremacy was an outcome of his teaching on that oneness. An investigation of Cyprian's writings of earlier date than the *De Unitate Ecclesiæ* proves conclusively that his teaching in the latter treatise was not invented to put down Novatian. In one of his earliest epistles he had

insisted that men 'cannot count on life and salvation if they will not obey the Bishops. For outside the Church they cannot live, inasmuch as the House of God is one, and no one can be safe but in the Church' (p. 189). A passage which Dr. Benson deems so decisive that 'it is impossible to conceive that the Church appeared to Cyprian to have ever carried itself on or subsisted without its episcopal order, or ever to have been anything but a unity' (p. 190).

Equally clear and convincing is the answer to the second question, which is worked out with overwhelming and concurrent testimony of Cyprian's theory and practice. He held that what the bishop was to his own diocese that the whole united body of bishops was to the whole Church; that the decrees of councils of the bishops formed the law of the Church; that decisions on important questions should be postponed until such councils could assemble and act in harmony; that even such councils could not, although unanimous, constrain a single dissentient bishop; and, finally, that our Lord alone had the office (*potestas*) of judging the episcopate. A headship attributed to one of them would simply ruin at once the whole of Cyprian's theory of the unity and of the authority which subsisted in the *copiosum corpus sacerdotum*.

The history of the forged interpolations in Cyprian's treatise on *The Unity of the Church* is given in Archbishop Benson's pages with the minute investigation and amplitude of detail which its interest and importance require. No section of the book is more curious or more conclusive. The utter absence of any early manuscript authority for the interpolations; the singular evidence of tampering with the original supplied by copies which contain the affected paragraph written in duplicate in the body of the treatise, both with and without the disputed words; the story of the intrigues which overbore the objections of learned editors like Latino Latini and Baluze, who decisively repudiated the insertion of the forged sentences; the touching witness which old copies of Cyprian bear to the agitations of spirit over these clauses; the significant traces yet remaining in the Paris edition of Cyprian of 1726 that the corrupted passages had been inserted after the printing of the rest of the work itself had been completed—these are the chief incidents in a literary forgery 'deliberately for three centuries past forced by papal authority in the teeth of evidence upon editors and printers who were at its mercy.' The concluding paragraph of Dr. Benson's examination of this appeal of the modern Church of Rome

to
of
run.

as a
may
came
polit
with
with
gran
first
with

as au

V
four
main
Laps
appe
and
sente
dark
gathe
which
distu
curso
Great
virule
lessn
unch
gran
summ
them
of the
body
city w
rich a
ample
sick a
a task
heath
plagu
the sla

to Cyprian on 'The Unity of the Catholic Church by Way of Interpolation'—such is the sarcastic heading of the section—runs as follows :

'Singular, hateful, and in its time effective, has been this forgery as a Papal aggression upon history and literature. Its first threads may have been marginal summaries in exaggerated language. Then came an unwarrantable paraphrase and a deliberate mutilation for a political purpose. Then it appeared in manuscripts of the author, with its indictment round its neck, side by side on the same page with the original, which it caricatured. Then it was forced into two grand editions, with an interval of a century and a half between them, first by the court of Rome itself, and then by the court of France with the fear of Rome before its eyes.

"*Tantæ molis erat Romanam condere Sedem.*"

'This is the true "Charter of the Investiture of the Papacy," and as authentic as other documents in that cartulary' (p. 219).

We are constrained to pass over the second, third, and fourth Councils of Carthage, A.D. 252-254, which dealt mainly with clerical applications under the Law of the Lapsed ; nor can we here do more than glance at the Spanish appeal to Cyprian against Rome, to which we shall return, and which the fourth Council decided by reversing the sentence of Pope Stephen. Fresh clouds of trouble were darkening the horizon as the earliest of these assemblies was gathering. Berber incursions into adjacent territories, by which many Christians were carried into slavery ; physical disturbances, famines, droughts, tornadoes, so often the precursors of yet deadlier visitations, prevailed ; and soon the Great Plague was ravaging the city with unexampled virulence. Then it was, amidst the collapse of heathen helplessness and the horrors inseparable from pestilence raging unchecked by moral force or medical skill, that the true grandeur of Christian strength and energy was seen. Cyprian summoned the whole Christian community, and called upon them to devote themselves and all their substance to the care of the sick, without distinction of race or creed. The entire body, almost without exception, responded to his call. The city was divided into districts, in each of which the Christians, rich and poor alike, took the parts assigned to them. An ample fund was raised and provision made for nursing the sick and burying the dead. The trials inseparable from such a task were aggravated for the Carthaginian Christians by heathen ingratitude, which attributed the visitation of the plague to Christian neglect of the gods and clamoured for the slaughter in the arena of those who were spending their

life's blood to succour them. Under such trying conditions Cyprian moved his flock to faith and patience, not by relaxing the demand which Christ makes upon them 'that would come after Him,' but by striving to raise them to the loftiest height of unconditional altruism. *Respondere Natalibus* was his motto. Let them walk worthily of the vocation wherewith they were called. It is well to be so reminded that care for the sick is not an evolved product of our advanced nineteenth-century civilization, but is a fundamental law of the Gospel of self-sacrifice.

Nor were these external troubles the only or the most trying anxieties which beset the North African believers. It was in truth a day when an interpreter of life's riddles was sorely needed. Thick and fast, one after another, sorrows were falling upon a distracted world, and even the stoutest of hearts might quail before the sore judgments which devastated the empire. How were Christians, who equally with their heathen neighbours suffered such accumulated miseries, and had to bear besides the unmerited reproach and the consequent persecution for being the cause of them—how were they to reconcile their sufferings with the repeated promises of Divine protection—'a thousand shall fall beside thee and ten thousand at thy right hand, but it shall not come nigh thee'? Can we wonder if at times faith reeled under the pressure of such calamities, or that even believing men's hearts were failing them for fear? Can we wonder if heathen ingratitude for Christian mercy displayed to the plague-stricken, awoke some resentment in those who were buffeted for their well-doing? Can we wonder if firm resolution occasionally degenerated into fanaticism, 'so fatal afterwards to Africa, and chafed when death threatened to forestall their martyr-crown'?

'For what,' asks Dr. Benson, most opportunely, 'was the Church of Carthage? It was an unpopular yet important section of a great city population, overmastered by powerful ideas, unfamiliar as yet with their manifold applications; dragged daily into contact with bitter social hardships, then suddenly made sharers in the world-wide terrors of the Plague, then accounted responsible for its mysterious origin; flung back thus on the old enigmas of existence and not exempted from new enigmas in their faith—such a body needed indeed that some broad and Christian view of this physical calamity should be opened before them. The work of mercy had been organized, but to control these cross currents of feeling required yet greater skill and delicacy. To beard a slanderous tormentor was perhaps a duty, but a harder one was to maintain, in a people so tried, the gentleness and tranquillity of spirit, the intel-

liger
line

quid
lity,
sion
pers
were
who
for
the
hens
Chri
remi
whic
ough
thos
the
To a
Plato
the p
one
and
the p
tortu
test
cians
trust
God'
calm
from
Mort

'I
the et
revere
your
ing ce
no an
much
the as
immor
the U

Cy
Steph
the m

ligence of devotion, the sense of unity with God which marked the line between the Church and polytheism' (pp. 256, 257).

It was to meet this urgent want that Cyprian put forth in quick succession three of his finest treatises—on The Mortality, on the Lord's Prayer, and the Exhortation to Confession. In the confusion which followed the fresh renewal of persecution, Churches, whose bishops had been banished or were in concealment, whose Lapsed were still unreconciled, whose very offices were suspended, were calling on all sides for Cyprian's presence and counsel. Many fled in despair to the desert, and were there haunted in their solitude by apprehension that a lonely exile was no adequate confession of Christ. The doubting hearts so shaken he reassured by reminding them that these are the beginning of sorrows which our Blessed Lord had predicted, and whose occurrence ought therefore to create no difficulty to Christians. To those who feared to lose their crown he replies that it is not the martyr's blood but the martyr's faith that God requires. To all believers equally he recalls the truth, unrevealed to Plato, unpreached by Cicero, that the idea of Probation is the philosophy of suffering, the interpretation of sorrow; that one stroke of providence effects both the discipline of love and the censure of sin; that if the noisome repulsiveness of the plague deepens the trial, it is yet far preferable to the torturer's polluting fingers; that the dread pestilence is the test of service of the sick, of the self-devotedness of physicians, of pitifulness to sick slaves; that it enforces absolute trust in a heavenly Father's care, and, through resignation to God's unfathomable purposes, elevates and purifies and calms. To these brief sentences, many of them borrowed from Dr. Benson's paraphrase of Cyprian's treatise on the Mortality, we must add yet one short concluding paragraph:

'Let us realize what we mean by the presence of Christ and the eternal society, the increasing hosts of our friends, the loved, the revered, the sainted who are there. His voice swells to lyric fervour and preludes the most majestic of odes. For him the cheering certainties of exalted life are dashed by no pagan reminiscence, no anticipated mediævalism. He cannot mourn the departed though much he misses them like distant voyagers. He cannot brook even the assumption of black garments as a memorial of those who wear immortal white. "Put the terror of death out of doors, dwell on the Undyingness beyond it"' (pp. 263, 264).

Cyprian's relations with Rome during the episcopate of Stephen bring into high relief the groundlessness of even the more moderate claims of the Papacy to spiritual supre-

macy, and afford cynical and conclusive evidence of the reasons which prompted the audacious forgeries on which we have already enlarged. Yet the utter helplessness of such later inventions is seen in their complete incongruity with facts 'writ large' (in Dr. Benson's striking phraseology) in Cyprian's corrections of the successor of Lucius. So far was Cyprian from acknowledging the supremacy of the Roman pontiff, that we find him admonishing Stephen of his duty towards Novatianism, and desiring him to send an account to Carthage of the manner in which he had discharged it; we find the African Church receiving appeals against and reversing the Pope's decisions; we find Cyprian repeating to Stephen his own theory of episcopal unity as indisputable and of universal acknowledgment; we find him recognizing in the Bishop of Rome only the same liberty of differing from the councils of the African Churches which he was prepared to concede to the meanest bishop of the most insignificant of cities. It is not, indeed, as our author remarks, 'the business of history to be reviving blots which have faded from the world's mind, but to mark and trace all life which was ever true and all truth which ever lives.' In the contrasted tempers of the Bishops of Rome and Carthage we may find some explanation of their contrasted policy. In Cyprian there was 'an under-tint of puritanism;' whilst Stephen 'was an early type of the regular Roman policy of comprehension on easy terms saving as to the one article of submission: ready in Spain to restore semi-pagans to the episcopate; ready in Gaul to uphold the harshest repeller of penitents; ready anywhere to receive Marcionites without Baptism to Communion' (p. 309): ready ever to bear in mind, with its own interpretation of the words, the classic maxim, 'Tu regere imperio populos Romane memento.'

We have no space for details of the circumstances which led to the Spanish appeal to Carthage. 'This wild tale, so to speak, of the old Border Life between Christianity and Paganism' (p. 233), affords an example of difficulties not dissimilar to those which are the trial and opprobrium of modern missions. During the Decian persecutions the Bishops of Leon and Merida had both relapsed to paganism, and the fall of each was aggravated by pronounced impieties. Of course, their sees had been refilled by properly elected and recognized successors, when Stephen was persuaded to declare that he held them still as the lawful occupants of their chairs. The Spanish Churches appealed to Cyprian, and in the Fourth Council of Carthage, held A.D. 254, at

which
acce
not
care
point
brevi
on th
witho
down
Holy
dispe
where
law.
draw
insist
divine
of a
and
mark
gation
is ves
sence
episco
A
appea
moder
True
for hi
the p
occup
contro
be ex
another
this le
sion f
might
Rome
instruc
Dr. Pe
Roma
the un
guardi
of a pl
followi
'No

which thirty-seven bishops were assembled, the appeal was accepted and the sentence of Stephen reversed. It is not easy to condense, with due regard to clearness and care not to omit any essential particular, the four essential points stated by Dr. Benson with his wonted emphatic brevity, on which the Synodical Epistle issued from Carthage on this occasion supplies conclusive evidence: 1. They reverse, without hesitation, the Bishop of Rome's decision, and lay down that the sole rule to be recognized is that enjoined in Holy Scripture. 'There can be no acceptance of person, no dispensation granted by any human indulgence, in matters where divine prescription interposes a veto and appoints a law.' 2. It assigns the laity the right and the duty of withdrawing from the communion of a sacrilegious bishop. 3. It insists on the presence of the laity—'in accordance with divine tradition and apostolic observance'—at the selection of a bishop: that he may be chosen under the eyes of all, and be approved as worthy by public testimony. 4. It marks that there is no power inherent in a Christian congregation to assign episcopal authority over itself. The election is vested in the nearest bishops of the province, in the presence of the commons, and the bishops must confer the episcopate by the laying on of hands.

An examination of the conduct and issue of the Gaulish appeal is not more favourable to Roman claims, although her modern advocates have endeavoured to build upon it largely. True it is that in this instance Cyprian, while blaming Stephen for his indifference at Marcion's misconduct, acknowledges the patriarchal primacy of the Roman See and urges its occupant to recall the Gallic Churches to their duty; but 'of control in things of faith,' adds Dr. Benson, 'of jurisdiction to be exercised administratively, executively or legislatively in another see, of sole or immediate supremacy without appeal, this letter presents no least trace' (p. 321). With this conclusion from authority at once so guarded and so competent we might well leave this subject, but one further illustration of Rome's recent controversial methods is too characteristic and instructive to be passed over. Monsignor Freppel and Dr. Peters read into Cyprian's letter the concession to the Roman pontiff of ordinary and immediate jurisdiction over the universal Church, the acknowledgment that he is the guardian and defender of its canons, and the ascription to him of a plenitude of authority, to which Dr. Benson makes the following rejoinder.

'Not only are such terms as "ordinary and immediate jurisdic-

tion," "defender of canons for the universal Church," ridiculous in their anachronism; not only is the phrase "use the plenitude of your authority" an invention of Freppel's own, which he prints as a citation and comments on as original; but the whole language of both authors is in the teeth of the text. The text assigns the function of excommunication, involving deposition, to one authority, the duty of substitution to another, and neither of these offices to Stephen, who is simply urged to press their duty, as became his place, upon the Bishops and Laity of Provence' (p. 322).

The limitations of our space forbid more than a passing reference to the chapter entitled 'Intercalary,' in which Dr. Benson discusses the place of Presbyters in the administration of Church business. We must content ourselves with recording his conclusion, drawn from the practice of the Church in Cyprian's days, that it is absolutely a negation alike of the Presbyterian and the Papal idea. 'Scarcely less does it contrast with that modern sharpness which would fence off each diocese as a preserve in which neighbour bishops have no concern or interest' (p. 330).

The discussion of the question of Rebaptism occupies necessarily a larger space in Dr. Benson's volume, as it did in the life of Cyprian, than it will probably command in the interest of any save the earnest theologian. For the controversy has long been settled on Catholic principles in the opposite sense to that which Cyprian upheld, and the great lesson to be learned from it of Christian liberty to think diversely without losing the right of intercommunion is only one example of that wider charity which alone can bring about the reunion of Christendom, but is as yet rather a distant ideal than an aim within the range of practical attainment. With his accustomed wealth of historic learning Dr. Benson explains the sources from whence Cyprian inherited his teaching—the tradition of Africa, the tradition of Asia Minor East, the Acts and Monuments of the earlier Carthaginian Councils on this question, the arguments on either side and the position of the leaders. It was on September 1, A.D. 256, that the seventh council under Cyprian and the third on Baptism was held. It was the fulfilment of a great vision, when no less than eighty-seven bishops from the provinces of Africa, Numidia, and Mauretania met under the presidency of Pope Cyprian, attended by presbyters and deacons and a vast concourse of the faithful laity.

The descriptive powers of ecclesiastical historians have been tested and played in vivid pictures of great Church councils, which suggest a comparison or a contrast with the

narr
writ

the
Emp
life.
mora
hard
Emp
pract
its be
them
elect
spirit
saint
had n
the w
realti

travel
as sin
as "c
build
the si
and th
schola
towns
by lay
Christ
sionar
civilis
centre
focus
consis

'N
of the
used a
Bozrah
govern
cian na
and A

'T
then b
pure E
the be
have b
masters

'T

narrative of each fresh labourer in the same fruitful field, yet we question whether Stanley or Milman, or any contemporary writer, has drawn a more graphic sketch than the following:

'The bishops were the elected judges, overseers, and teachers of the Christian section of as many African towns. No part of the Empire was more full than Africa of intellectual, civic, and financial life. The Christian section was the army of advance in things social, moral, and religious. It was the section which at present found it hardest to assert its rights, whether individual or corporate, in the Empire. Yet it was developing new institutions, theoretically and practically. It was already creating a new literature, and it had in its bosom the constitution and legislation of the future. Brought up themselves in daily sight of justice and of rule, the bishops had been elected to their presidencies because in them was recognised the true spirit of rule, of instruction, of sensible converse with men. The special saintliness of asceticism, which might have procured election later on, had not yet come into vogue. A new spiritual power "had come into the world," and it was committed to them to exercise it in a world of realities.

'The towns from which they came and through which they travelled, presented the social life of the age in almost every aspect—as simple "municipia," as "free and exempt" cities or republics, or as "colonies" loaded with tithes and privileges, and splendid with buildings which, like the amphitheatre of Thysdrus, rivalled or outdid the similar structures of Rome. Their elaborate official organizations and their administrations, fiscal and agrarian, are as well known to scholars as modern finance is to the officials of our Treasury. The list of towns shews how immediately the early Christians faced their problems by laying hold of the centres of life and activity. The policy of the Christian Church was in all respects unlike that of the modern Missionary Society. It handled Christianisation as the State handled civilisation. It began with strong focal centres. It threw out fresh centres as fast as it could make them strong and safe. It left no new focus unsupported. It gave each bishop the utmost independence consistent with unity.

'Nothing can exceed the variety of the social situations. Some of these cities were primæval settlements of Canaanites, which still used and occupied their rock-cisterns and half-solid citadels or Bozrahs of gigantic stones; which, with all their accretions, were yet governed by Sufetes, the "Judges" of Palestine, stamped their Phœnician names on their coinage until late in the Empire, and served Baal and Ashtoreth in Imperial temples.

'The Homeric Lotus land, the large low Isle of Meninx, just then beginning to call itself Girba, maintained, as it does to-day, a pure Berber stock, which had learnt of these Canaanites to grow the best dates and dye the brightest and costliest purples. They have been impartially receptive of all the successive faiths of the masters of the mainland.

'The island rock of Thabraca, whose peak rose some three or four

hundred feet above its busy little port and the forests of the mainland, was own daughter to Tyre, and mother of all the coral fisheries of the Western Mediterranean. And while the peculiar Punic fish-craft was then the wealth, as it is still the subsistence, of Hippo Diarrhytus and other towns, the bishop of Carpos was bishop of a bright and fashionable seaside spa.

'Of many seaports represented some were still the insecure little roadsteads which had for centuries shipped off the precious yield of Numidian mines and the homely produce of Kabylia farms. Other immense elaborate harbours had grown up as factories of Carthage; others enclosed a vast precinct for the chief corn-markets of the world, and depots for the grain which fed the proletariat of Rome. . . . Tripolis and the Emporia were rich and luxurious amid unceasing wars with the invading tribes and the advancing sands of the Sahara. Other cities were seated among illimitable slopes of corn, or overlooking the High Plateaux, or among the forests through which ran chains of villages and lines of road still marked by broken oil-mills, dry fountains, and post-stations. Crystal rivers, which after short courses now plunge in sands, were then banked and quayed, and at last led off in a thousand channels of irrigation. Cirta, the old capital of Numidia, on earth's most perfect city-throne, was with consummate wisdom long allowed to maintain with four antient surrounding burghs a sort of unity or republic of their own.

'The vast region of Mount Aures, with its rich uplands and inaccessible lairs of restive tribes, was girdled with a ring of strong and brilliant towns, and was held chained, as it were, to Carthage and its orderly powers by Hadrian's great work, the new straight road of near two hundred miles to Theveste. To that ring belonged the military centre of Lambæsis, the beautiful Thamagudi, the most antient mart of commerce, and Theveste, the centre of communication. And these were model cities also, each a miniature Rome, with every appliance of domestic, civil, and luxurious existence that could keep legions and tribes engaged. Not only theatre and amphitheatre for their dissipated and ferocious amusement, temples to the gods and genii of Health and Commerce and Fatherland, whether Tyre or Rome, baths, with all their amusements, triumphal arches which set forth the conquests of emperors and the motherliness of empresses, ample basilicas ready to become churches, forums and mimic curiæ in which business was discussed by orators with all the semblance of freedom. Here soldiers had unusual privileges of marriage, and their children were enrolled in an honourable tribe. Along the Theveste road itself, constructed by the Third Legio Augusta, was a line of fresh thriving stations, with here and there an antient town renewed, so populous that before long there was a Christian See every thirteen miles or so. Further off huge frontier fortresses, like Capsa, "fenced with sands and serpents," held the key of Sahara for the whole Tell, and controlled the caravans which laboured up and down and across the enormous basins of the salt lakes, or, like Gemellæ, created their own oasis and there held the utmost bastion of civilization against the Spirit of the Desert—

who
ado
Mac
walle

unwo
Ther
mark
knew
life a
that
delive
"ente
(pp. 3

It
uphel
valid,
Catho
in wh
comm
counc
of the
an as
dispos
and s
and t
Cypri
nothin
faithfu
its infl

Th
of Cyp
lumino
and hi
attribu
nant in
prevail
rescrip
withho
against
death p

'Th
contract
in civilis
and the
persecut
VOL.

who after all is master. In safer districts lay what were simply the adorned and noble cities of Peace—Thuburbo, Assuras, Thelepte, Mactharis, and many others, above all, Sufetula, which was not even walled.

'In short, the material spectacle of these African cities was not unworthy of their setting in Nature. And what more can be said? There is no measuring them by our small and sombre ideas of market towns and appropriate public works. Yet many heathen knew that all the brilliance was darkened by a reckless using up of life and hopelessness in death. The Christian Bishop in each knew that he and his were armed with a message of reality. To the delivery of it it was vital that they should be of one mind about this "entering into life." Therefore they met at Carthage about Baptism' (pp. 365-369).

It is needless to repeat the arguments by which Cyprian upheld the Council's decision, that heretical baptism was invalid, and that the rite must be repeated on admission into the Catholic Church. If his conclusion was erroneous the spirit in which he maintained it was so gentle and tolerant as to command the admiration of all subsequent ages. Why the councils failed is attributed by the Archbishop to the absence of the laity, whose practical sagacity might have influenced an assembly exclusively composed of functionaries naturally disposed to acquiesce in the opinions of their brother officials, and some of whom avowed their ignorance on the subject, and their desire simply to secure a unanimous decision. Cyprian's abandonment of his earlier practice, to transact nothing without the concurrence of the presbyterate and the faithful laity, was disastrous alike in his own lifetime and in its influence on the subsequent history of the Church.

The renewal of persecution which involved the martyrdom of Cyprian, was due to circumstances which Dr. Benson luminously explains. The two remarkable men, Valerian and his trusted adviser Macrian, who then ruled the empire, attributed the deepening calamities of the age to the malignant influence of Christianity, and the tolerant policy hitherto prevailing was suddenly reversed by imperial edict and rescript, directed against the Church. It is impossible to withhold our sympathy from upright men vainly struggling against the appalling adversities which betokened the first death pangs of the Roman Empire.

'The whole Empire,' says Dr. Benson, 'was girt as with an ever-contracting ring of fire. No worse time of misery has ever hemmed in civilisation. The barbarian might at any moment be anywhere, and the plague was everywhere. Macrian then was not the one persecutor. He was the voice and spirit of the Empire.

'The essence of the Empire was unity, one army, one law, one senate. The adoration of the majesty of the Emperor, with which no national or local worship interfered, was a necessity which grew more vital as the danger from without grew universal. The most tolerant of emperors could not deny that in the midst of all there was an ever-multiplying power, which defied the central unity. Another unity was growing up and growing everywhere which, as it would not adore Cesar, could not, men thought, but make common cause with the violators from without. The very usurpers were less traitorous because their aim was at least to perpetuate in themselves the imperial unity. Whenever any stir directed imperial or popular attention to the Christians, there was visible in them an anti-Roman and therefore anti-human unity, which was believed to compact itself by the darkest and most uncompromising bonds.

'In every district it had its local chief, about whom adherents rallied. Everywhere, even when they obediently abandoned their social evening meetings, even when the old theory of "an illicit religion" could not be pressed consistently any longer, still everywhere unexplained "conventus" met; any individual who obeyed the magistrate by sacrificing to the Majesty of Augustus, evidently ceased to be a member of their corporation; and everywhere the cemeteries had a weird fascination for them; especially if there lay in them agents who had suffered the extreme penalty of the law' (p. 461).

It was June 257 when Valerian placed an edict in Macrian's hands to separate the Christians from their bishops, to forbid their meetings and to prohibit their visiting the cemeteries. It was first designed to be bloodless, and on August 30 Cyprian was summoned before the Proconsul Aspasius Paternus, in reply to whose inquiries Cyprian gave answer, 'I am a Christian and a Bishop, I know no other gods but the one and true God who made heaven and earth, the sea and all that is in them. He is the God whom we Christians wholly serve. Him we supplicate day and night for ourselves and all men and for the safety of the Emperor.' 'Do you persist, then, in this purpose?' 'That a good purpose formed in the knowledge of God should be altered is not possible.' 'Well, will it be "possible" for you, in accordance with the directions of Valerian and Gallien, to depart as an exile to Curubis?' 'I depart,' was the calm reply.

Deportation into exile involved the loss of citizenship, but Cyprian had no further severity to complain of, beyond the isolation from his people, and even this was alleviated by constant visitors, who supplied his every want. Yet his mind was filled with thought of the testimony which he expected to seal with his blood, and a remarkable dream convinced him that the time of his departure was at hand. His chief anxiety was that he should be permitted to suffer at

Carthage, because, as he had written years before, 'the victim which has to set before the brotherhood the pattern of manliness and faith, ought to be offered up in the presence of his brethren.'

His prayer was heard. On the very day year of his dream after the briefest of trials he was led out to die, with the cry of the Christian bystanders still ringing in his ears, 'Let us too be beheaded with him.' We have no space for the details of his martyrdom. It was a worthy confession before a vast multitude in which one thing only was lacking that the sufferer desired. He believed implicitly in the immediate inspiration of the Holy Spirit, and in reply to his last earthly prayer he had hoped some message to his beloved people would be given him, but he could not recognize any such inspiration and he was silent. One mighty stroke of the centurion's sword 'and so suffered the blessed Cyprian.'

It has been Cyprian's signal fortune to meet in Archbishop Benson with a biographer—at once a scholar and a saint, a fervid Churchman, and a born ruler of men—who was thoroughly in sympathy with the man to whose career and work he devoted all the leisure of a crowded lifetime. Shall we try under his guidance to give a brief final estimate of the Carthaginian bishop whose influence has been so pervasive that he 'alone of Latin Fathers was really recognized by the world-contemning Greeks,' and is the one non-Roman commemorated in the Roman Canon, and yet whose distinctive position has been very imperfectly understood in later days? Amongst the Charismata which the Holy Spirit divides for the building up of the body of Christ, a foremost place in dignity and importance must be assigned to gifts of government, and these were bestowed in no ordinary measure on Cyprian—exceptionally and providentially prepared for their exercise in his earlier heathen life. Yet his was not merely the trained intellect which could grasp ruling principles of action and define them with transparent accuracy, his was also the practical comprehension which realized and impressed on others the working of these principles out, and making them live and breathe for Christian men; and his was further the abounding charity in the broadest sense of that most Christ-like grace which would not only spend and be spent for others, but could tolerate difference of opinion and maintain the bond of peace with those who repudiated doctrines which he held very close to his heart. This one great deep longing for the unity of the Church—to be upheld, not at the

sacrifice of truth and conduct, but on the widest principles of toleration consistent with their maintenance—was the one absorbing undying passion which breathed in Cyprian's every thought and action. How he kindled the imagination and captivated the affection of St. Augustine, shines out in many a quotation given in Dr. Benson's pages. 'He educated the whole moral tone, dissipated undisciplined ignorance of doctrine, brought order to the lives of men,' says Gregory of Nazianzus (p. 240). 'If my sins do not disable me, I will learn if I can, from Cyprian's writings assisted by his prayers, with what peace and what consolation the Lord governed His Church through him;' so wrote Augustine, whose own debt to Cyprian was immense and ever most freely acknowledged. If he made one great mistake on the Baptismal question, 'the great Church,' as Dr. Benson finely observes, 'held on her way, and every generation, as it swept its sands over Cyprian's error, bore witness to the strength of Cyprian's passion for unity. Whilst he seems almost dearer because he could not be perfect, the perfectness of that passion of his is still unrealised, and too often unfelt' (p. 424).

In a day when something of Cyprian's passion for unity—despite serious and all but insurmountable obstacles—is rekindled in the hearts of Christians, we believe that the study of Dr. Benson's monograph will be immensely serviceable in helping to define the conditions on which the restoration of the Church's broken unity can alone be carried out. For his book is not only an armoury of Catholic truth against every form of separatist error, Ultramontane or Puritan; but it is replete with insistence upon the great fundamental principles which make for peace, and it is on these that the dying primate dwells most impressively in his concluding pages. To us they seem golden sentences to be treasured up in the hearts and transmuted into the lives of Churchmen.

'What Cyprian meant is summed up by Augustine and rounded into one exact and perfect phrase. *Salvo jure communionis diversa sentire*. He means that schools of Thought are not Communions. He means that the Apostleship and the Apostolic Creed are enough. He means that the harmony of mankind, in a world which is a world of Beginnings, never will be a harmony intellectual or metaphysical, but that it may even now be a harmony spiritual and sacramental.

A true unity has to take account equally of Christ's Prayer and of Christ's Laws: of the Prayer which He offered over the sacrifice of Himself, and of the Laws which Himself, our Creator, impressed on the intellectual existence of our race. One centre we have, but the approaches to it from without, the radii of thought, are infinite.

'In that saying lies enfolded the germ of Christ's Prayer—*just communionis*—and the germ of Christ's natural Law, *diversa sentire*.

'The Church which masters that saying, which roots it as the principle of the thought which itself cherishes and encourages, which fructifies it in the action which itself enterprises, that Church was and is the Church of the Future' (pp. 533-4).

ART. III.—EARLY CHRISTIAN MISSIONS IN SOME OF THEIR RELATIONS TO HEATHEN RELIGIONS.

1. *A Sermon preached for the Oxford Mission to Calcutta.* By the Rev. CHARLES GORE, Canon of Westminster. (London, 1897.)
2. *The One Religion.* Bampton Lectures for 1881. By the Rev. J. WORDSWORTH, M.A. (Oxford, 1881.)
3. *The Christian Platonists of Alexandria.* Bampton Lectures for 1886. By the Rev. C. BIGG, D.D. (Oxford, 1886.)

'THE scientific study of missions,' said Archbishop Benson in 1894, 'is a thing which is beginning.' The statement contained a warning to Churchmen, and the warning was a timely one. For the missionary work of the Church of England, despite manifold discouragements, has been a record of very speedy growth, and it has been more than her missionaries have been able to do to overtake the work actually pressing on them; nor can it be doubted that in consequence the work has suffered from inadequate guidance.

In particular this has been the case in regard to the treatment of heathen religions. It cannot be expected that earnestness and love for souls can supply the place of that insight and wise prudence which need a wide and thorough experience and the enlightenment of the spirit of God. But this is just what the first Christians possessed; and they could pass from their conversion to missionary enterprise just because their lives had given them the needful training and insight.

It is from this point of view that we would recall our readers' attention to two books which deserve not to be forgotten by students of mission work. The *Bampton Lectures* of Bishop J. Wordsworth and of Dr. Bigg differ widely in point of view; and in the statements of one of them there is much from which we might find ourselves compelled to dissent. But they are alike real endeavours to study the

non-Christian religions of the world in relation to the one truth, and to investigate the position which accredited teachers of the Church have from time to time adopted in dealing with them. In what we have to say we shall be very largely indebted, as will be apparent, to both these writers, especially to Dr. Bigg's discussions on the teaching of Origen and the Alexandrian Clement. The scientific study of missions is still beginning, though these books were published in the last decade. But it makes slow progress; though it is true that we can congratulate ourselves on Mr. Jevons' *Introduction to the History of Religion*, which was lately noticed in these pages and which is a solid contribution to the literature of the subject. There is also Dr. Cust's *Gospel Message*, the usefulness of which can scarcely be valued too highly; but he would himself probably admit that his work is critical and negative rather than constructive. And there is Canon Gore's sermon preached at the last anniversary of the Oxford Mission to Calcutta. Certainly it bears traces of not having been written for publication, and this, no doubt, was unavoidable and natural; but we know no quarter to which we might more confidently look for counsel and help, grounded as it would be on a devotion to the missionary cause and a practical knowledge of missionary work.

For the treatment of non-Christian religions by Christian missionaries is an urgent and practical question, and not more urgent than it is difficult. Isolated missionaries must deal with it, with all its hazardous perplexities, with its almost infinite variety and its subtle modifications, and with its more dangerous appeals to the fundamental loyalty of a Christian soul. The honour of Christ our Lord is at stake; and this cry of loyalty is claimed alike by both parties who are at issue on the question. The honour of Christ—is that consistent with the recognition of any truth in the perishing religions of heathendom? The honour of Christ—is that consistent with any limitations of the hidden providence of God in the dark places of the earth?

The problem confronted the Church in her first days; it thwarted the brilliant and devoted mission work of the Roman Church in China; it is thwarting us to-day as we confront Islam, some of us endeavouring to teach the Mohammedans a true knowledge of that Divine Unity whom they ignorantly worship, while other of our missionaries will have none of such compromise and frankly declare the God of Mohammed to be the power of evil.

And we cannot but feel some sympathy with those de-

vot
'po
ani
ano
mu
ima
san
tha
Wo
mo
way

An
whi
givi
the
whi
evil
'He
not
the
two
too
mis
that
othe

and
was
The
the
law.
Chri
leas
Gen
deep
thin
privi
resto
of t

1
μον, κ
ἡμῶν
St
μετ' ε
2

voted men who shrink from surrendering that belief in the 'perishing of the heathen' and their religions which, after all, animated the fiery love of such missionaries as St. Ignatius and St. Francis Xavier. 'Remember,' cries St. Francis, 'the multitudes of the heathen who, though created in Thine image, are perishing through their ignorance;' and, in the same spirit, a well-known South African missionary declared that he laid down the *Bampton Lectures* of Bishop John Wordsworth unread, for he dared not risk the loss of the motive power which had driven him to rescue souls from a way of destruction.

Two principles are thus brought sharply into contrast. And the divergence is natural; for the original truth from which they start has in fact two aspects. They are both given sharply and clearly in the words of our Lord, and there is no attempt to reconcile them: 'There is no man which shall do a miracle in My name that can lightly speak evil of Me. For he that is not against us is on our part;' and 'He that is not with Me is against Me; and he that gathereth not with Me scattereth abroad.'¹ One great truth underlies these two utterances; but, stated as they are, they appeal to two opposed forms of human character; and it is scarcely too much to say that each of the two opposite policies of missionary work has fortified itself by emphasizing unduly that which it found congenial, and unduly neglecting the other.

But the problem involved is nothing less than the nature and scope of the divine system of Redemption. What that was as regards the Jew is clear beyond necessity of proof. The Eternal Son became incarnate in order to fulfil alike the enactments and the hopes and promises of the Mosaic law. The pious Jew attained not to the blessings of the Christian covenant. He was not made perfect;² but at least he was the son of a covenant. What of that great Gentile world, which the Jew had learned to believe lay in a deep impenetrable darkness? He had taught himself to think of that, at best, as being a possible candidate for the privilege of serving Israel, when Israel's race should be restored at the coming of Messiah. We learn from the Acts of the Apostles with what difficulty the first Christian

¹ St. Mark ix. 39, 40, οὐδεὶς ἐστὶν ὃς ποιήσει δύναμιν ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου, καὶ δυνήσεται ταχὺ καταλογῆσαί με. ὃς γὰρ οὐκ ἔστι καθ' ἡμῶν, ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἐστίν.

St. Matth. xii. 30, ὁ μὴ ὦν μετ' ἐμοῦ κατ' ἐμοῦ ἐστί, καὶ ὁ μὴ συνάγων μετ' ἐμοῦ σκορπίζει.

² Heb. xi. 39, οὗτοι . . . οὐκ ἐκομίσαντο τὴν εὐαγγελίαν.

teachers overcame their own national repugnance, and admitted Gentile converts freely to equal privileges with themselves. But still the vital question was almost untouched. What were they to say of the great world which was not converted, with its religions and its philosophies? That world was a concrete reality to them, ranged in so clear and determined opposition that they could easily understand and obey a command not to love it nor the things of it.¹ If that were all it were easy. But was that the same world of which the same Apostle had written 'God so loved the world'?²

What indications are there, then, of the relation in which that old world stood to God?

The very fact of the covenant is in itself an indication. Abraham obeyed the call of God. But we are not to suppose that that call was a capricious act. The unique distinction of Abraham was not that he was called, but that he was obedient, and this is his peculiar glory. But the whole race stood in the same relation to the Eternal Father. One by one they were all called; only Abraham's power of yielding himself to the Divine Will enabled all his circumstances—even a belief in human sacrifice—to draw him nearer to God. He believes, trusts, obeys, and his faith—not his call—is counted to him for righteousness.

Further, the story of his contemporary, Melchizedek, will lead us to a similar conclusion as regards the uncovenanted relation of a Gentile to the Father of all. The use made of that story by the writer to the Hebrews deserves, perhaps, more careful consideration than it sometimes receives. Melchizedek is introduced in that Epistle as typifying in some sort the priesthood of Christ. Not, it would seem, that the writer accepts him as a complete type. The argument is not that Melchizedek's priesthood was superior to that of Levi, and Melchizedek's was a type of Christ's priesthood; and therefore that Christ's priesthood is superior to the Levitical: rather, in the writer's view, Christ is regarded as the ideal priest. To the Hebrew there had been but one true priesthood, that of Levi; and in his view all other was a negation of priesthood. To this the writer opposes a single fact, but one sufficient to overthrow the Hebrew theory, viz. the priesthood of Melchizedek. Here, he seems to say, was an instance of true priesthood, but not Levitical; nay, in some sort, superior to that, since Abraham, the ancestor of Levi, submitted himself to it, and in this case Christ, the

¹ 1 John ii. 15, *μὴ ἀγαπᾶτε τὸν κόσμον, μηδὲ τὰ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ.*

² St. John iii. 16, *οὕτως ἠγάπησεν ὁ Θεὸς τὸν κόσμον.*

Gree
inde
the
that
not
God
The
that
that
Abra
Love
the s

A
Me,
repro
sion.
heav
we m
beha
specu
such
throu

B
exact
speak
that
of Hi
of vie
'for t
of the

S
is at
He d
before
Paph
worsh
a stri
of the
the A
the pr
strang
one G

¹ C
See al
² A

Great High Priest, swept into His own Priesthood that, and indeed all other, forms of true priesthood, of which His is the Archetype. But, for our purpose, it is important to notice that Melchizedek was truly a 'priest of the Most High God,' not only, therefore, in relation, albeit uncovenanted, with God, but himself presumably the channel of grace to others. The mercy of God flowed as man would let it. It might be that at one moment no alternative was left but the Flood; but that is the work of man's obstinacy. Melchizedek and Abraham are instances in the world of His uncovenanted Love unchecked by man's sin. We are led at once to expect the severance uttered by Christ.

And this severance 'He that is not with Me is against Me,' and 'He that is not against us is on our part' is at once reproduced in the first work of the Apostles after the Ascension. St. Peter declares that 'there is none other name under heaven given among men [beside the name of Jesus] whereby we must be saved.' But this statement would be claimed on behalf of those who attach the highest value to the nobler speculations of Gentile philosophy¹; for they would say that such truth as was thus attained to was reached by Gentiles through the grace of Christ without their knowledge.

But there are other passages in which the Apostles more exactly reproduce their Master's sayings. Thus St. Peter, speaking to Cornelius, has learned that 'in every nation he that feareth Him [God] and worketh righteousness is accepted of Him';² exactly as St. Paul wrote from the opposite point of view, placing all men on one level before eternal justice, 'for there is no difference; for all have sinned and come short of the glory of God.'³

Similarly, St. Paul in addressing purely heathen audiences is at pains to find common ground between himself and them. He does not throw down their altars, nor denounce the gods before whose images they made their offerings. He is at Paphos in Cyprus; but there is no word of the prevalent worship there, and the reticence of the writer of the Acts forms a striking contrast with the elaborate outspokenness of some of the Apologists. On the contrary, at Lystra the attitude of the Apostles is one of real sympathy. There is no doubt that the priests of Zeus Propoleos were prepared to adopt these strangers as representatives of the gods, or, if it be so, of the one God who appears in the local mythology under different

¹ Cf. Landriot, *Le Christ de la Tradition*, *passim*, especially i. 193. See also S. Justin Mart. *Apol. II.* viii. qu. p. 107, note 1 *infra*, p. 64.

² Acts iv. 12.

³ Romans iii. 22, 23.

forms.¹ The sympathy and self-control of St. Paul are the more impressive as he endeavours to lead his hearers to a truer conception of the 'living God,' who, though He did not visit men in the way that they supposed,² 'nevertheless left not Himself without witness in that He did good, and gave us rain from heaven and fruitful seasons, filling our hearts with food and gladness.'³

Similarly in his address at Athens⁴ St. Paul endeavours to stand on common ground with his hearers. The nameless altar gives him his opportunity. They, it is true, are so steeped in polytheistic ideas that they can extract from his address only two new deities⁵ whom they suppose to be candidates for admission into their mythology; but this only makes it the more clear how determined was St. Paul's method.

To these is to be added St. Paul's use of heathen authors. Even the quotation from Epimenides,⁶ though of no dogmatic importance, shews that the Apostle had no instinctive aversion to them as such; while the reference he makes to Aratus at Athens, as testifying by his words τοῦ γὰρ καὶ γένος ἐσμένυ,⁷ is of directly doctrinal value.

But, on the other hand, St. Paul guards very carefully the use which he thus permits himself to make of the natural religion of the heathen. He distinguishes, not perhaps in so many words, but in practice unmistakably, between the knowledge of the truth possible to the natural man, and the use which the Gentile world made, or failed to make, of it. Not even St. John's conception of the whole world lying in wickedness⁸ is so terrible as the picture of moral collapse with which the Epistle to the Romans⁹ opens; or as the account of the pathetic failure of a world which had vainly devoted its best wisdom to find out God;¹⁰ for if the moral result of its highest

¹ Ramsay, *Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 58.

² *Ib.* The commentators refer to the story of Baucis and Philemon.

³ Acts xiv. 15, 17. Cf. Gore, *Sermon*, p. 38: 'St. Paul . . . can be exceedingly severe—no man more severe—on the moral and religious practices of heathen nations, especially if he sees any inclination . . . to relapse into heathen practices. Then, in language which burns, St. Paul lays bare the ignominy and the horror of heathen life. But you know also that, if you want to bring an individual to Christ, you had better not begin by abusing, you had better not begin by severity. You had better begin by making the very best of him, by going all the way you dare and can to meet him as he is.'

⁴ Acts xvii. 16. Cf. Rom. i. 19, 20.

⁵ *Ib.* 18.

⁶ Titus i. 12. Note that St. Paul gives to Epimenides the title of προφήτης, by which he was apparently known to heathen writers. See Alford *in loc.*

⁷ Acts xvii. 28.

⁸ Rom. i. ii. 12, 14, 15.

⁹ St. John v. 19.

¹⁰ 1 Cor. i. 21, ii.

efforts at knowledge brought about actual subversion of the moral sense, the formal acts of religion resulted in devotion to demons: they become 'inventors of evil things';¹ they not only do such things as they know are worthy of death, but 'have pleasure in such as do them';² and 'the things which [they] sacrifice, they sacrifice to devils (*δαίμονις*) and not to God.'³

Such, then, was the guidance under which the first Christian missionaries passed to the conversion of the heathen world. It is a matter of no little interest, practical and doctrinal, to see in what way they met this problem which must have constantly confronted them. In pursuing this inquiry, we become at once aware of its difficulty. The circumstances under which those missionaries worked were entirely different from our own; and, as a matter of fact, there is but little evidence in their writings that the question was raised in the form in which it is familiar to us in dealing with *e.g.* Mohammedan or Buddhist inquirers. The free preaching, which is so common a feature of a missionary's life in Asia to-day, was not common, to say the least, in ante-Nicene times. For whatever reason—and the reflection suggests a question of great interest—the Christian faith was clothed with an attractiveness which compelled a humble devotion on the part of inquirers, and which contrasts painfully with some episodes of modern mission work; and St. Augustine's account⁴ of his opening interview with a would-be catechumen, the distant greeting, the deliberate and rather repellent cross-examination as to the applicant's motives, throws into startling relief an announcement of an Indian bishop to the effect that missions in his diocese were improving, since natives no longer looked to being paid for becoming Christians! There are signs that later missions are returning to the awe which lay upon the early Church, and which kept ever before her mind the responsibility of admitting to a share in the Christian Name.⁵

The reticence which thus guarded the sacred mysteries with a jealous fear will lead us to expect considerable difficulty in tracing in their writings the action which the early missionaries adopted. For the most part converts who were eager to be admitted to the privileges of their new faith would feel little need for any reconciliation between it and that which they were passionately abjuring. The recollection of hideous rites would haunt them too vividly; and it would

¹ Rom. i. 30, *ἐφευρετὰς κακῶν*.

² *Ib.* 32, *συνευδοκῶσι τοῖς πρᾶσσοις*.

³ 1 Cor. x. 20.

⁴ *De Cat. Rud.* ix.

⁵ Cf. Newman, *Callista*, ch. xxxi.

be with them as it is *e.g.* with natives in Africa, with whom circumcision has been a tribal custom, and who, when converted, decline for the most part to admit that that rite can be consistent with Christian living; so indissolubly is it associated in their minds with circumstances which a Christian must needs abhor.¹

We shall find, then, in the early writers traces sufficiently distinct of a readiness to recognize the truth which the greater philosophers and poets had reached; but we shall find, too, that in actual practice they had to deal with religions which had drifted sufficiently far from these earlier moorings, and to which they had to offer uncompromising resistance. They were confronted, not with the speculations of ethereal dreamers, but with systems of licensed sin.

It will be convenient to deal with the extracts from their works mainly in chronological order.

In the Apostolic Fathers we find little to our purpose, save the exclamation of St. Polycarp,² as he turned to the crowd in the amphitheatre; this is clearly entirely rhetorical in its nature. There is, besides,

St. Clement (?), or rather the author of the Second Epistle to the Corinthians attributed to him, who writes as follows regarding the state of the heathen: 'He saved us when we were perishing . . . we, who were maimed in our understanding, and worshipped stocks and stones, and gold and silver and bronze, the works of men; and our whole life was *nothing else but death*. While then we were thus wrapped in darkness and oppressed with this thick mist in our vision, we recovered our sight, putting off by His will the cloud wherein we were wrapped.'³ And in a later chapter the writer speaks of the heathen deities as the 'dead gods.'⁴

HERMAS, in an interesting passage, appears to make a distinction between the opportunities and the judgment to which the Christians and the heathen respectively would be subject: thus, 'The days of repentance are accomplished for the saints; whereas for the Gentiles there is repentance until

¹ It is a fact that native clergy have consistently withstood efforts to arrange for the rite of circumcision being so administered as to render it possible for such Christian natives as desired to receive it.

² Pol. ap. Smyrn. Ep. 9: αἰρε τοὺς ἀθέους.

³ S. Clem. Rom. ad Cor. II. i. 4-8 (Lightfoot's translation): ἡπολλυμένους ἡμᾶς ἔσωσεν . . . πηροὶ ὄντες τῇ διανοίᾳ, προσκυνοῦντες λιθοῦς καὶ ξύλα καὶ χρυσὸν καὶ ἄργυρον καὶ χαλκόν, ἔργα ἀνθρώπων· καὶ ὁ βίος ἡμῶν ὅλος ἄλλο οὐδὲν ἦν εἰ μὴ θάνατος· ἀμαύρωσιν οὖν περικείμενοι καὶ τοιαύτης ἀχλὺς γέμοντες ἐν τῇ ὁράσει, ἀνεβλέψαμεν ἀποθέμενοι ἐκείνο ὃ περικείμεθα νέφος τῇ αὐτοῦ θελήσει.

⁴ Ib. iii. 1, ἡμεῖς οἱ ζῶντες τοῖς νεκροῖς θεοῖς οὐ θύομεν.

the la
includ
for d
they
burne

T

predi

tainly

theni

anal

accou

nor c

'when

thing

folly,

and w

ought

worsh

Christ

And

comm

of wha

ST

on th

demon

he rec

his re

Christ

'When

to bring

the den

¹ He
δικαίους
τοῖς δὲ
some th
post-bap
to seek

² Ib.
μετενόη

³ Ad
ζονται, οἱ

⁴ Ib.
ἀφροσύνη

λογιζόμε

⁵ Ib.
αὐτὸν ἐλθ

the last day.¹ But, on the other hand, in the parables he includes 'Gentiles' and 'sinners' in a like punishment, though for different reasons. 'The sinners shall be burned because they sinned and repented not; but the Gentiles shall be burned because they knew not Him that created them.'²

The writer of the Epistle to Diognetus, whether or not predisposed to a Jewish view of Gentile religions, shews certainly a singular tendency to disparage Judaism and heathenism together, as if their errors were in some sense analogous. Thus: 'They [the Christians] neither take account of those who are regarded as gods by the Greeks, nor do they observe the superstition of the Jews:'³ and 'whereas the Greeks, by offering these things [sacrifices], things that are senseless and deaf, make an exhibition of folly, the Jews, who present these self-same things to God, and who do it as if they considered He were in need of them, ought in all reason to count it foolishness and not religious worship.'⁴ So, too, in the following: 'Therefore ye hate the Christians, because they do not consider these to be gods.'⁵ And finally he appears to conclude Jew and Gentile in a common darkness: 'For what man at all had any knowledge of what God was, before He came?'⁶

ST. JUSTIN MARTYR.—In his *First Apology* he ascribes on the one hand the fierceness of the persecutors to 'evil demons;' but on the other hand, unlike some early writers, he recognizes the peculiar position of a man like Socrates and his relation to the truth, which is analogous to that of Christianity:

'When Socrates endeavoured by true reason and examination to bring these things to light, and deliver men from the demons, then the demons themselves compassed his death, as an atheist and pro-

¹ *Hermas, Past. Vis. II. ii. 5* (Hilgenfeld, p. 12), ἡ μετάνοια τοῖς δικαίοις ἔχει τέλος, πεπλήρωνται αἱ ἡμέραι τῆς μετανοίας πᾶσιν τοῖς ἀγίοις· καὶ τοῖς δὲ ἔθνεσιν μετανόια ἐστὶν ἕως ἐσχάτης ἡμέρας. It is held, however, by some that this passage refers to a distinction between pre-baptismal and post-baptismal sin. In the former case it was always open to the sinner to seek baptism.

² *Ib. Sim. iv. 4* (p. 62), οἱ μὲν ἀμαρτωλοὶ καυθήσονται, οἱ δὲ ἡμαρτον καὶ οὐ μετενόησαν, τὰ δὲ ἔθνη καυθήσονται, οἱ δὲ οὐκ ἔγνωσαν τὸν κτίσαντα αὐτοὺς.

³ *Ad Diogn. i.* οὐτε τοὺς νομιζομένους ὑπὸ τῶν Ἑλλήνων θεοὺς λογίζονται, οὐτε τὴν Ἰουδαίων δεισδαιμονίαν φυλάσσουσι.

⁴ *Ib. ii.* ἃ γὰρ τοῖς ἀναίσθητοις καὶ κωφοῖς προσφέροντες οἱ Ἕλληνες ἀφροσύνης δείγμα παρέχουσι, ταῦθ' οὗτοι καθάπερ προσδεομένων τῷ Θεῷ λογίζονται παρέχειν, μωρίαν εἰκὸς μᾶλλον ἡγοῦντ' ἂν, οὐ θεοσέβειαν.

⁵ *Ib. ii.* διὰ τοῦτο μισεῖτε χριστιάνους, οἱ τοὺς οὐχ ἡγούμενους θεοὺς.

⁶ *Ib. viii.* τίς γὰρ ὅλως ἀνθρώπων ἡπίστατο τί ποτ' ἐστὶ Θεός, πρὶν αὐτὸν εἰλεῖν;

fane person, on the charge that "he was introducing new divinities;" and in our case they display a similar activity.¹

He allows a parallel between the judgments of Rhadamanthus and Minos and the judgment of Christ,² but with the difference that in the former the punishment is for a thousand years, and in the latter it is everlasting. He goes on to say³ that idol worship is in itself folly; and the idols have not the form of God, but of demons. Then, with a recollection of his earlier life, he declares that his old worship was that of demons.⁴ He is able, however, to find in heathenism analogies to Christian doctrine in the Sibylline oracles and the prophecies of Hystaspes; in the Stoic prediction of a destruction of the world by fire; then

'While we say that all things have been produced and arranged into a world by God, we shall seem to utter the doctrine of Plato . . . and while we maintain that men ought not to worship the works of their hands, we say the very things which have been said by the comic poet Menander and other similar writers.'⁵

The myths of the heathen were borrowed under the 'influence of the wicked demons' from the Jewish Scriptures and perverted;⁶ from the same source Plato obtained his cosmogony⁷ and his so-called doctrine of the cross.⁸

¹ Justin Mart. *Apol.* I. v. ὅτε Σωκράτης λόγῳ ἀληθείᾳ καὶ ἐξεστατικῶς ταῦτα εἰς φανερόν ἐπειράτο φέρειν, καὶ ἀπάγειν τῶν δαιμόνων τοὺς ἀνθρώπους, καὶ αὐτοὶ οἱ δαίμονες διὰ τῶν χαίρόντων τῇ κακίᾳ ἀνθρώπων ἐνήργησαν ὡς ἄθεον καὶ ἀσεβῆ ἀποκτείναι, λέγοντες καινὰ εἰσφέρειν αὐτὸν δαιμόνια. καὶ ὁμοίως ἐφ' ἡμῶν τὸ αὐτὸ ἐνεργούσιν. (The translations are chiefly from Clark's 'Ante-Nicene Library'.)

² *Ib.* viii. Πλάτων ὁμοίως ἐφῆ 'Ραδάμανθυν καὶ Μίνω κολάσειν τοὺς ἀδίκους παρ' αὐτοὺς ἐλθόντας. ἡμεῖς δὲ, τὸ αὐτὸ πρᾶγμα φαμέν γενήσεσθαι ἀλλ' ὑπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ τοῖς αὐτοῖς σώμασι μετὰ τῶν ψυχῶν γνωμένῳ, καὶ αἰωνίαν κόλασιν κολασθησομένων, ἀλλ' οὐχὶ χιλιονατῇ περιδοῦν, ὥς ἐκεῖνος ἐφῆ, μόνον.

³ *Ib.* ix. ὅπερ . . . ἄλογον ἡγοῦμεθα. Θεοῦ μορφὴν μὴ ἔχοντα, ἀλλ' ἐκείνων τῶν φανέντων κακῶν δαιμόνων καὶ ὀνόματα καὶ σχίσματα ἔχειν.

⁴ *Ib.* xiv. ὃν τρόπον καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐκείνων οἱ προδιαβεβλημένοι δαίμονες μὲν ἀπέστημεν. xxv. τοὺς πεθομένους ἐλευόμεν· τοὺς δὲ τούτων αἰτίους δαίμονας γνωρίζομεν.

⁵ *Ib.* xx. τῷ λέγειν ἡμᾶς ὑπὸ Θεοῦ πάντα κεκοσμηθῆαι καὶ γεγενῆσθαι, Πλάτωνος δόξομεν λέγειν δόγμα . . . τῷ δὲ καὶ μὴ δεῖν χειρῶν ἀνθρώποις κ.τ.λ.

⁶ *Ib.* liv. ὅτι ἀπάγῃ τοῦ ἀνθρωπείου γένους ἀποδεικνυμεν κατ' ἐνέργειαν τῶν φαύλων δαιμόνων. ἀκούσαντες γὰρ διὰ τῶν προφητῶν κηρυσσόμενον παραγένησόμενον τὸν Χριστόν, καὶ κολασθησόμενος διὰ πυρὸς τοὺς ἀσεβεῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων, προεβύλλοντο κ.τ.λ.

⁷ *Ib.* lix. παρὰ τῶν ἡμετέρων διδασκάλων λαβόντα τὸν Πλάτωνα.

⁸ *Ib.* lx. ὅτι λέγει, 'Ἐχίασεν αὐτὸν ἐν τῷ παντί, παρὰ Μωσέως λαβὼν ὁμοίως εἶπεν. Cf. xlvii. τὸν Χριστόν . . . προεμνηύσαμεν λόγον ὄντα, οὐ πᾶν γένος ἀνθρώπων μετέσχε· καὶ οἱ μετὰ λόγου βιώσαντες Χριστιανοὶ εἰσι, κἂν ἄθεοι ἐνομισθῇσαν· οἷον ἐν Ἑλλησι μὲν Σωκράτης καὶ Ἡράκλειτος καὶ οἱ ὅμοιοι

ana
wisc
the
Gen
in w
cal
the i
Socr
'
teach
partic
men-
Mus
well,
Word
is Chr
was a
them
know
neithe
Him,
did th

F
of H
said a
In
his ex
that th
that t

αὐτοῖς·
'Ἠλίας,
¹ *Ib.*
ἐτέκνωσ
² *Ib.*
³ *Ib.*
Σωκράτη
⁴ *Ib.*
κὸν λόγον
⁵ *Ib.*
γένει ἀνθ
⁶ *Ib.*
νομοθετή
ἐπειδὴ δὲ
πόλλας
ἀγνώστου
πατέρα κυ
ἀσφαλές
⁶ *Ib.*

St. Justin continues, in his second Apology, to trace analogies between the Christian Revelation and Gentile wisdom. The gods of the heathen or demons are really the offspring of the fallen angels, the 'sons of God' of Genesis.¹ So Christian and Gentile alike believed in a flood in which the family of one man was saved, 'who is by us called Noah, and by you Deucalion.'² Moreover, 'it is by the influence of the wicked demons that earnest men, such as Socrates and the like, suffer persecution and are in bonds.'³

'And those of the Stoic school—since so far as their moral teaching went they were admirable, as were also the poets in some particulars, on account of the seed of reason implanted in every race of men—were, we know, hated and put to death, Heraclitus *e.g.* and . . . Musonius.'⁴ 'For whatever either lawgivers or philosophers uttered well, they elaborated by finding and contemplating some part of the Word. But since they did not know the whole of the Word, which is Christ, they often contradicted themselves. . . . And Socrates . . . was accused of the very same crime as ourselves . . . and he exhorted them to become acquainted with the God who was to them unknown, by means of the investigation of reason, saying "That it is neither easy to find the Maker and Father of all, nor having found Him, is it safe to declare Him to all." But these things our Christ did through His own power.'⁵

Further, Justin quotes with approval Xenophon's 'Choice of Hercules.'⁶ And he repeats what he had previously said as to the indwelling of the Word in all men.⁷

In the *Dialogue with Trypho* he considers the result of his experience of the philosophies and reaches the conclusion that they have deteriorated and become 'many-headed,' but that they descend from a pure source. 'Philosophy is, in

αὐτοῖς· ἐν βαρβάροις δὲ Ἀβραάμ, καὶ Ἀνανίας, καὶ Ἀζαρίας, καὶ Μισαήλ, καὶ Ἡλίας, καὶ ἄλλοι πολλοί.

¹ *Ib.* II. v. οἱ δὲ ἄγγελοι . . . γυναικῶν μίξεις ἐπλήθησαν, καὶ παῖδας ἐτέκνωσαν, οἱ εἰσιν οἱ λεγόμενοι δαίμονες.

² *Ib.* vii. παρ' ἡμῖν καλούμενον Νῶε, παρ' ὑμῖν δὲ Δευκαλίωνα.

³ *Ib.* κατὰ τὴν τῶν φαύλων δαιμόνων ἐνέργειαν τοὺς σπουδαίους, οἷον Σωκράτην καὶ τοὺς ὁμοίους διώκεσθαι.

⁴ *Ib.* viii. καὶ τοὺς ἀπὸ τῶν Στωϊκῶν δὲ δογμάτων, ἐπεὶ κατὰ τὸν ἡθικὸν λόγον κόσμιοι γεγονόασιν, ὥς καὶ ἐν τισιν οἱ ποιηταὶ διὰ τὸ ἐμφυτον παντὶ γένει ἀνθρώπων σπέρμα τοῦ λόγου μεμισησθαι καὶ πεφονεύσθαι οἶδμεν.

⁵ *Ib.* x. ὅσα γὰρ καλῶς αἰεὶ ἐφθέγγαντο καὶ εὖρον οἱ φιλοσοφήσαντες ἢ νομοθετήσαντες, κατὰ λόγον μέρος εὐρέσεως καὶ θεωρίας ἐστὶ ποιηθέντα αὐτοῖς. ἐπεὶ δὲ οὐ πάντα τὰ τοῦ Λόγου ἐγνώρισαν, ὅς ἐστι Χριστός, καὶ ἐνάντια αὐτοῖς πόλλας εἶπον . . . Σωκράτης [δὲ] τὰ αὐτὰ ἡμῖν ἐνεκλήθη . . . πρὸς Θεοῦ δὲ τοῦ ἀγνώστου αὐτοῖς, διὰ λόγον ζητήσεως ἐπίγνωσιν προτρέπετο εἰπών· Τὸν δὲ πατέρα καὶ δημιουργὸν πάντων οὐθ' εὖρεῖν ῥάδιον, οὐθ' εὐρόντα εἰς πάντας εἰπεῖν ἀσφαλές (see *Timaeus*, 28 C).

⁶ *Ib.* xi.

⁷ *Ib.* xiii.

fact, the greatest possession, and most honourable before God, to whom it leads us and alone commends us; and these are truly holy men who have bestowed attention on philosophy.¹ Further, Justin holds that Bacchus, Hercules, and Æsculapius were invented by the devil 'imitating' Scripture,² and that Mithras has a similar origin.³ Finally, he comes to the curious conclusion, from a consideration of Deut. iv. 19, that 'God formerly gave the sun as an object of worship.'⁴

Of works which some attribute to St. Justin, the *Discourse to the Greeks* contains a general attack on the Greek mythology, while the *Hortatory Discourse to the Greeks* contains a general attack on them as guides, but implies their knowledge of the truth by alleging that they borrowed from Moses as in the cases of Orpheus,⁵ the Sybil,⁶ Homer,⁷ Sophocles,⁸ Pythagoras,⁹ Plato;¹⁰ and, finally,¹¹ in a tone very different from that of the second Apology, concludes that true knowledge was hidden from the philosophers.

In the treatise *On the sole Government of God*, also attributed by some critics to Justin, the writer states that 'human nature at first received a union of intelligence and safety to discern the truth, and the worship due to the one Lord of all, yet envy, insinuating the excellence of human greatness, turned men away to the making of idols.'¹² He proceeds to illustrate this thesis by quoting in succeeding chapters passages in which the poets assert the unity of God and a future judgement and teach that God desires not sacrifices, but righteousness.¹³

In a fragment on the Resurrection, similarly attributed to Justin, the writer, after examining the opinions of the philosophers, states that there is nothing in them inconsistent with a Christian doctrine, viz. the Resurrection.¹⁴

¹ S. Justin. *Dial. c. Tryph.* ii. ἐστὶ τῷ ὄντι φιλοσοφία μέγιστον κτῆμα, καὶ τιμιώτατον Θεῷ, ὃς τε προσάγει καὶ συνίστησιν ἡμᾶς μόνῃ· καὶ ὅσοι ὡς ἀληθῶς οὗτοί εἰσιν, οἱ φιλοσοφία τὸν νοῦν προσεσερχόμενοι.

² *Ib.* lxi.

³ *Ib.* lxx.

⁴ *Ib.* cxli. τὸν μὲν ἥλιον ὁ Θεὸς ἐδεδώκει πρότερον εἰς τὸ προσκυνεῖν αὐτόν.

⁵ S. Justin. *Cohort. ad Gr.* xv.

⁶ *Ib.* xvi. xxxvii.

⁷ *Ib.* xvii.

⁸ *Ib.* xviii.

⁹ *Ib.* xix.

¹⁰ *Ib.* xx.-xxxiii.

¹¹ *Ib.* xxxv. xxxvi.

¹² S. Justin. *De Monarchia*, i. τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης φύσεως τὸ κατ' ἀρχὴν συζυγίαν συνίσεως καὶ σωτηρίας λαβούσης, εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν ἀληθείας, θρησκείας δὲ τῆς εἰς τὸν ἕνα καὶ πάντων δεσπότην, παρεισδύσα εἰς εἰδωλοποιίας ἐξέτρεψε βασκανία τὸ ὑπερβάλλον τῆς τῶν ἀνθρώπων μεγαλειότητος.

¹³ *Ib.* ii. iii. iv.

¹⁴ S. Justin. ex lib. *De Res.* vi.

writ
afon
S
amo
'

gover
irati
provi
were
were
idols,
never
unive
arran

T
' T
Sibyl,
sophe
judgm
God c
dead;
vinced
the liv
of god
who as
impun

H
writ
Divine

¹ *F*
λησταίς
² S.
guberna
tionabil
Dei. E
tatibus
providet
fabricat
ponente

³ Th
τινές' το
μὴν καὶ
κρίσεως,
τῶν ζώντ
ἡλέγχοντ
λέγων·
συγγραφ
εἶπον περ
VOL.

before
; and
ion on
ercules,
Scrip-
ully, he
f Deut.
of wor-

e Dis-
Greek
Greeks
implies
ey bor-
Sybil,⁶
ully,¹¹ in
y, con-
philo-

od, also
es that
nce and
the one
human
¹² He
ceeding
unity of
ires not

tributed
of the
nconsis-

κτῆμα, καὶ
ὡς ἀληθῶς

προσκυνεῖν

κατ' ἀρχὴν
ρησκείας δὲ
ἐξέτρεψε

Lastly, in an isolated fragment, preserved by Tatian, that writer reports that St. Justin 'rightly declared that the aforesaid demons resembled robbers.'¹

ST. IRENÆUS, discussing the question of Natural Religion amongst the Gentiles, has the following :

'It follows of course that the things which are watched over and governed be acquainted with their ruler ; which things are not irrational nor vain, but they have understanding derived from the providence of God. And for this reason certain of the Gentiles, who were less addicted to [sensual] allurements and voluptuousness, and were not led away to such a degree of superstition with regard to idols, being moved, though but slightly, by His Providence, were nevertheless convinced that they should call the Maker of this universe the Father Who exercises a providence over all things, and arranges the affairs of our world.'²

THEOPHILUS OF ANTIOCH writes thus to Autolycus :

'The poets corroborate the testimony of the prophets. . . . The Sibyl, then, and the other prophets, yea and the poets and philosophers, have clearly taught, both concerning righteousness and judgment and punishment, and also concerning providence, that God cares for us, not only for the living among us, but also for the dead ; though indeed they said this unwillingly, for they were convinced by the truth . . . [e.g. Timocles] "The dead are pitied by the living God." . . . And the writers who spoke of a multiplicity of gods came at length to the doctrine of the unity of God, and those who asserted chance spoke also of providence, and the advocates of impunity confessed that there would be a judgment.'³

Here it is to be noticed that Theophilus speaks of heathen writers passing from polytheistic conceptions to that of the Divine Unity, and herein he differs apparently from other

¹ *Fragm. i.* ὁρθῶς ἐξεφώνησεν εὐκείναι τοὺς προειρημένους [δαίμονας] ληστοαῖς.

² S. Iren. III. xxv. 1. 'Necesse est igitur ea, quæ providentur et gubernantur, cognoscere suum directorem ; quæ quidem non sunt irrationabilia, neque vana, sed habent sensibilitatem perceptam de providentia Dei. Et propter hoc ethnicorum quidam, qui minus illecebris et voluptatibus serviunt, et non in tantum superstitione idolorum coaducti sunt, providentia eius moti, licet tenuiter, tamen conversi sunt, ut dicerent fabricatorem huius universitatis Patrem omnium providentem, et disponentem secundum nos mundum.'

³ Theoph. *ad Autol.* II. xxxvii. xxxviii. ἀκόλουθα ἐξείπον [τῶν ποιητῶν τινές] τοῖς προφήταις. . . . τοῖνυν Σίβυλλα, καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ προφῆται, ἀλλὰ μὴν καὶ οἱ ποιηταί, καὶ φιλόσοφοι, καὶ δεδωκάσιν περὶ δικαιοσύνης, καὶ κρίσεως, καὶ κολάσεως· ἔτι μὴν καὶ περὶ προνοίας, φροντίζει ὁ Θεὸς οὐ μόνον τῶν ζώντων ἡμῶν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν τεθνεώτων, καίπερ ἅπαντες [? ἄκοντες] ἔφασαν· ἠλέγχοντο γὰρ ὑπὸ τῆς ἀληθείας . . . τοῦτοις ἀκόλουθοι εἰρηκεν καὶ Τιμοκλῆς, λέγων· Τεθνεῶνιν ἔλεος ἐπιεικὲς Θεός. καὶ περὶ πληθύνουσιν θεῶν οἱ συγγραφεῖς εἰπόντες κατήλθον εἰς μοναρχίαν, καὶ περὶ ἀπρονοησίας λέγοντες εἶπον περὶ προνοίας, καὶ περὶ ἀκρισίας φάσκοντες ὁμολόγησαν ἔσσεσθαι κρίσιν.

early Christian authors, who are unanimous in speaking of polytheism as a declension from original truth.

ST. CYPRIAN again is practically silent on the subject before us. In his case we might naturally have expected not unfrequent indication of his view of contemporary heathen religion. The fact of his silence is in itself suggestive, and we may infer that in his view the question was not of great practical importance. However he, in common with other early writers, sees a certain recollection and involuntary evidence of the truth of the unity of the Godhead in such expressions as 'O God,' 'God sees,' 'I commend to God,' 'God give you,' 'as God will,' 'if God should grant'; 'and this,' he adds, 'is the very height of sinfulness, to refuse to acknowledge Him Whom you cannot but know.'¹

From TERTULLIAN we obtain fuller information. And it may be right to appreciate the more highly any indications of truth to be found in the heathen world by one who was not disposed to seek for it there. There is no need to support by quotations his detestation of the life and practice of the heathen; there is perhaps a special interest in his adducing any evidence on their behalf.

The very title of the treatise *De Testimonio Animæ* is in itself evidence that Tertullian expected to discover a sense of religious truth where Christianity was not; and this is borne out by the opening sentence of the treatise, the object of which is to 'convince the rivals and persecutors of Christian truth, from their own authorities, of the crime of at once being untrue to themselves and doing injustice to us';² and he goes so far as apparently to sympathize with Christian apologists who had stated that 'we have embraced nothing new or monstrous [in becoming Christians]—nothing for which we cannot claim the support of ordinary and well-known writings, whether in ejecting error from our creed or admitting truth into it.'³

Further he refers to such phrases as those quoted above

¹ Cyprian, *De Van. Idol.* ix. 'Namque et vulgus in multis Deum naturaliter confitetur, cum mens ex anima sui auctoris et principis admonetur. Dicit frequenter audimus, o Deus; et Deus videt; et Deo commendo . . . Atque hæc est summa delicti, nolle agnoscere quem ignorare non possis.'

² Tert. *De Anim.* i. 'Ut æmuli persecutoresque eius [Christianæ veritatis] de suo proprio instrumento et erroris in se et iniquitatis in nos rei revincantur.'

³ *Ib.* ' . . . Recognosci possit nihil nos aut novum aut portentosum suscepisse, de quo non etiam communes et publicæ litteræ ad suffragium nobis patrocinentur, si quid aut erroris eiecimus, aut æquitatis admisimus.'

in co

'If s

'By

is dis

Him

too,

their

Him

...

"God

In fa

the

exist

testin

a wit

In

that

the re

harm

In

thus:

'One

natura

error;

the di

the im

knowle

opinion

will us

gods.'

In

¹ T

illi com

negas d

Minerv

... D

est, De

² *Ib.*

christia

³ A

non ess

⁴ D

sapere

quod si

enim et

noster p

tiantis:

tantis I

in connexion with St. Cyprian—'Which may God grant,' and 'If so God will'—of which he adds :

'By expressions such as these thou declarest that there is one who is distinctively God, and thou confessest that all power belongs to Him to Whose will as Sovereign thou dost look. At the same time, too, thou deniest any others to be truly gods, in calling them by their own names of Saturn, Jupiter, Mars, Minerva ; for thou affirmest Him to be God alone to whom thou givest no other name than God. . . . Nor is the nature of the God we declare unknown unto thee : "God is good, God does good," thou art wont to say.'¹

In fact the passage from which this is quoted is a witness to the reality of the knowledge which Tertullian maintains exists among the Gentiles ; and he concludes : 'O striking testimony to truth, which in the very midst of demons obtains a witness for us Christians.'²

In the *Apologeticus*, on the other hand, Tertullian argues that no charge lies against the Christians for being traitors to the religion of the heathen ; 'for we cannot be held to do harm to that which has no existence.'³

In the treatise on *The Resurrection of the Flesh*, he writes thus :

'One may no doubt be wise in the things of God, even from one's natural powers, but only in witness to truth, not in maintenance of error ; only when one acts in accordance with, not in opposition to, the divine dispensation. For some things are known even to nature : the immortality of the soul, for instance, is possessed by many ; *the knowledge of our God is possessed by all*. I will use, therefore, the opinion of a Plato, when he declares "Every soul is immortal." *I will use also the conscience of the people, when it attests the God of gods.*'⁴

In strange contrast to this stands the opening chapter of

¹ Tert. *De Anim.* ii. 'Ea voce et aliquem esse significas, et omnem illi confiteris potestatem ad cuius spectas voluntatem, simul et ceteros negas deos esse, dum suis vocabulis nuncupas, Saturnum, Iovem, Martem, Minervam. Nam solum Deum confirmas, quem tantum Deum nominas. . . . De natura quoque Dei quem prædicamus nec te latet : Deus bonus est, Deus benefacit, tua vox est.'

² *Ib.* 'O testimonium veritatis, quæ apud ipsa dæmonia testem efficit christianorum.'

³ *Apol.* xxvii. 'Quo non videamur lædere eam quam ostendimus non esse.'

⁴ *De Res. Carnis.* iii. 'Est quidem et de communibus sensibus sapere in Dei rebus ; sed in testimonium veri, non in adiutorium falsi ; quod sit secundum divinam, non contra divinam dispositionem. Quædam enim et natura nota sunt, ut immortalitas animæ penes plures, ut Deus noster penes omnes. Utar ergo et sententia Platonis alicuius pronuntiantis : Omnis anima immortalis. Utar et conscientia populi, contentantis Deum deorum.'

the *De Anima*, in which Tertullian denies any real knowledge of the soul to Socrates, and appears almost to jeer at the events of the last sacred hours of his life as described in the *Phædo*. The harshness of this judgment is, however, somewhat softened by the opening words of the second chapter: 'Of course we shall not deny that philosophers have sometimes thought the same things as ourselves. The testimony of truth is the issue thereof.'¹

In his *Treatise against Marcion*, Tertullian is naturally led to an estimate of the value of natural religion, since his antagonist disparaged the natural world and its Creator. Accordingly he writes:

'The greater part of the human race, although they knew not even the name of Moses, much less his writings, yet knew the God of Moses; and even when idolatry overshadowed the world with its extreme prevalence, men still spoke of Him separately by His own name as God, and the God of gods, and said, "If God grant," and "As God pleases," and "I commend you to God." . . . From the beginning the knowledge of God is the dowry of the soul, one and the same amongst the Egyptians, and the Syrians, and the tribes of Pontus. For their souls call the God of the Jews their God.'²

MINUCIUS FELIX in his apologetic dialogue, *Octavius*, uses the common argument from popular exclamations to show that, unconsciously, the belief in the Divine Unity persisted among the heathen.

'Is this,' he asks, 'the natural discourse of the common people, or is it the prayer of a confessing Christian? And they who speak of Jupiter as the chief are mistaken in the name indeed, but they are in agreement about the unity of the power.'³

He appeals, too, to the poets and philosophers as declaring the one God with almost prophetic explicitness.

'I hear the poets also announcing "the one Father of gods and men;" and that such is the mind of mortal men as the Parent of all has appointed his day. What says the Mantuan Maro? Is it not

¹ *De Anim.* ii. 'Plane non negabimus aliquando philosophos iuxta nostra sensisse: testimonium est veritatis etiam eventus ipsius.'

² *Adv. Marc.* i. x. 'Maior popularitas generis humani, ne nominis quidem Mosis compotes, nedum instrumenti, Deum tamen Mosis norunt, etiam tantum idololatria dominationem obumbrante; seorsum tamen illum quasi proprio nomine Deum perhibent et Deum deorum, et "Si Deus dederit," et "Quod Deo placet," et "Deo commendo." . . . Animæ a primordio conscientia Dei dos est; eadem nec alia et in Ægyptiis, et in Syris, et in Ponticis. Iudæorum enim Deum dicunt animæ Deum.'

³ *Min. Fel. Oct.* xviii. 'Vulgi iste naturalis sermo est, an Christiani contentis oratio? Et qui Iovem principem volunt, falluntur in nomine, sed de una potestate consentiunt.'

even
he s
heav
The
The
char

'Ah
ever
You
agree

And
num
tions

'I ha
more
altho
tians
Chris

A

letter
consi
Divin
worsh
does
of th
'Poet
atheis
and h
very
and c

¹ M
homin
omniu
verius
intus a
spiritu

² I
homin
nobisc

³ I
illustri
ut quia
fuisse

⁴ A
ἀδελφ

even more plain, more apposite, more true? "In the beginning," he says, "the spirit within nourishes, and the mind infused stirs the heaven and the earth," and the other members "of the world." . . . The same poet in another place calls that mind and spirit God.¹

Then, after quoting Thales' description of origins, he thus characterises it:

'Ah! a higher and nobler account of water and spirit than to have ever been discovered by man. It was delivered to him by God. You see that the opinion of this original philosopher absolutely agrees with ours.'²

And after having passed in short review the opinions of a large number of other philosophers, he summarises his observations:

'I have set forth the opinions of almost all the philosophers whose more illustrious glory it is to have pointed out that there is one God, although with many names; so that any one might think that Christians are now philosophers, or that philosophers were then already Christians.'³

ATHENAGORAS had the cultivated instincts of a man of letters. In dealing with the religious notions of his time he consistently distinguishes between the knowledge of the Divine Unity to be found among the heathen and the 'idol' worship popularly current. In his *Plea for the Christians* he does not hesitate to draw an analogy between the proceedings of the Christians and those of the poets and philosophers. 'Poets and philosophers,' he pleads, 'have not been voted atheists [as were the Christians] for inquiring concerning God;'⁴ and he quotes Euripides and Sophocles accordingly. He then very briefly examines opinions of some of the philosophers, and concludes that 'the unity of the Deity is confessed by

¹ Min. Fel. Oct. xix. 'Audio poetas quoque unum patrem divum atque hominum prædicantes, et talem esse mortalium mentem, qualem parens omnium diem duxerit. Quid Mantuanus Maro? nonne apertius, proximius, verius? Principio, ait, cælum et terras et cetera mundi membra spiritus intus alit, et infusa mens agitat. . . . Idem alio loco mentem istam et spiritum Deum nominat.'

² *Ib.* 'Eho, altior et sublimior aquæ et spiritus ratio quam ut ab homine potuerit inveniri a Deo tradita. Vides philosophi principalis nobiscum penitus opinionem consonare.'

³ *Ib.* xx. 'Exposui opiniones omnium ferme philosophorum, quibus illustrior gloria est Deum unum multis licet designasse nominibus: ut quibus arbitretur aut nunc Christianos philosophos esse, aut philosophos fuisse iam tunc Christianos.'

⁴ Athen. Leg. pro Christ. v. ποιηταὶ μὲν καὶ φιλόσοφοι οὐκ ἔδοξαν ἄθεοι ἐπιστήσαντες περὶ Θεοῦ. . . . συνάδοντος . . . καὶ Σοφοκλέους, εἰς ταῖς ἀληθείαισιν, εἰς ἑστὶν Θεός, δὲ οὐρανὸν τ' ἔτευξε καὶ γαῖαν μακρὰν.

almost all even against their will.¹ On the other hand he is equally decided in his view of popular religious practice. The multitude regarded stocks and stones as gods,² and only derived the names of their gods from Hesiod and Homer,³ while poets and philosophers alike agree that the gods were really created beings.⁴ But philosophers, *e.g.* Thales and Plato, were aware of a single supreme divinity, the one God, by whatever name He was called; and thus after quoting from the *Phædrus* the description of the 'great sovereign in heaven, Zeus, driving a winged car, advancing first, ordering and managing all things, and following him a host of gods and demons,' Athenagoras comments:

'This does not refer to the Zeus who is said to have sprung from Kronos; for here the name is given to the Maker of the universe. This is shown by Plato himself: not being able to designate Him by another title that should be suitable, he availed himself of the popular name, not as peculiar to God, but for distinctness, because it is not possible to discourse of God to all men as fully as one might.'⁵

Finally Athenagoras in an interesting passage draws a parallel between the heathen conception of the Divine Unity and the 'idols' on the one hand, and the Christian doctrine of God and the 'demons' on the other. 'They who draw men to idols,' he says, are the 'demons.'⁶

ARNOBIUS wrote his seven books of *Disputationes adversus Gentes* as the pledge of the truth of his conversion, for the reassurance of those to whom he had been known as a sincere pagan. He shows himself thoroughly alive to the degradations of pagan polytheism; but he is able, for all that, to postulate that 'we all,' *e.g.* Christians and pagans, 'grant that there is only one great Being.'⁷

LACTANTIUS, writing at the beginning of the fourth century, was perhaps the scholar of Arnobius; if so, his reputation speedily outstripped his master's, and he became

¹ Athen. *Leg. pro Christ.* vii. τὸ εἶναι ἐν τῷ Θεῷ, ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πλεῖστον, κἀν μὴ θέλωσι, τοῖς πᾶσι συμφωνηταί.

² *Ib.* xv.

³ *Ib.* xvii.

⁴ *Ib.* xviii. xix.; *cf.* xxix. xxx.

⁵ *Phædr.* 246 E, ap. Athen. *Leg.* xxiii. καὶ τὸ εἰρημένον αὐτῷ 'ὁ δὲ μέγας ἡγεμὼν ἐν οὐρανῷ Ζεὺς, ἐλαύνων πτηνὸν ἄρμα, πρῶτος πορεύεται διακοσμῶν πάντα καὶ ἐπιμελούμενος· τῷ δὲ ἑπεταὶ στρατὸς θεῶν τε καὶ δαιμόνων,' οὐκ ἐπὶ τοῦ ἀπὸ Κρόνου λεγομένου ἔχει Διὸς. ἐστὶ γὰρ ἐν τούτῳ ὄνομα τῷ ποιητῇ τῶν ὅλων· δηλοῖ δὲ αὐτὸς ὁ Πλάτων, ἑτέρῳ σημαντικῷ προσεπτέιν αὐτὸν οὐκ ἔχων, τῷ δημῷ δεινόνματι, οὐχ ὡς ἰδίῳ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἀλλ' εἰς σαφήνειαν, ὅτι μὴ δύνατον εἰς πάντας φέρειν κατὰ δύναμιν τὸν Θεόν, προσεχρήσατο.

⁶ Athen. *Leg.* xxvi. οἱ περὶ τὰ εἰδωλα αὐτοὺς ἔλκοντες οἱ δαίμονες εἰσιν οἱ προσηρημένοι.

⁷ Arnobius, *Adv. Gentes*, i. xxviii. 'Si omnes concedimus unum esse principem solum, quem nulla res alia vetustate temporis antecedit.'

celeb
gener
religio
traces

Th

'Let u
tomed
From
they h
not to
Thus,
stood t
heaven

He q
Proce
weigh
gates
Antist
totle,
the ca
any g
placed
things
God.'
comes
touche
infatua

The
he qu
affirme
no the
they w
testifyi

¹ La
citemus
his unum
veritatem
tam cæc
Natura
potestate

² *Ib.*
certiusqu

³ *Ib.*
Quam m
demonst
nisi eos
⁴ *Ib.*

celebrated as a rhetorician throughout the empire. His view generally is that the 'gods' of the heathen, of the popular religion, are deified men; but there reside with the heathen traces of an earlier belief in the true Divine Unity.

Thus:

'Let us cite as witnesses those very persons whom they are accustomed to make use of against us—I mean the poets and philosophers. *From these we cannot fail in proving the Unity of God*; not that they had ascertained the truth, but that no one can be so blind as not to see the divine brightness presenting itself to his eyes. . . . Thus, *under the guidance of nature and reason*, he [Orpheus] understood that there was a power of surpassing greatness which framed heaven and earth.'¹

He quotes Homer, Virgil, and Ovid to the same effect. Proceeding to the philosophers, 'whose authority is of greater weight, and their judgment more to be relied on,'² he investigates briefly the teaching of Thales, Pythagoras, Anaxagoras, Antisthenes, Cleanthes, Anaximenes, Chrysippus, Zeno, Aristotle, Plato, and Cicero; though it must be admitted that in the case of Cleanthes and Anaximenes it is difficult to give any great value to their evidence. Seneca appears to be placed alone by Lactantius. Of him he says, 'How many . . . things like to our own writers did he speak on the subject of God.' And in regard to the philosophers in general he comes to the conclusion 'that men of the highest genius touched upon the truth and almost grasped it, had not custom, infatuated by false opinion, carried them back.'³

Then, speaking of the Sibyls and of Hermes Trismegistus, he quotes passages in which the Divine Unity is explicitly affirmed.⁴ It is of no importance to our subject whether or no these authorities be genuine. In Lactantius' judgment they were authentic, and as such they are quoted by him as testifying to the truth. Similarly he quotes a Delphic oracle,

¹ Lactant. *Instt.* l. v. 'Eos ipsos [auctores] ad veri probationem testes citemus quibus contra nos uti solent, poetas dico et philosophos. Ex his unum Deum probemus necesse est: non quod illi habuerint cognitam veritatem; sed quod veritatis ipsius tanta vis est, ut nemo possit esse tam cæcus qui non videat ingerentem se oculis divinam claritatem. . . . *Natura igitur et ratione ducente intellexit Orpheus esse præstantissimam potestatem cæli ac terræ conditricem.*'

² *Ib.* 'Ad philosophos veniamus, quorum gravior est auctoritas, certiusque iudicium.'

³ *Ib.* 'Quam sæpe summum Deum merita laude prosequitur! . . . Quam multa alia de Deo nostris similia locutus est. . . . Nunc satis est demonstrare summo ingenio viros attigisse veritatem, ac pene tenuisse, nisi eos retrorsum infatuata pravis opinionibus consuetudo rapuisset.'

⁴ *Ib.* vi. cf. IV. vi. viii.

Apollo being in his judgment a 'demon,' in which the unity of God is implied ;¹ and he refers to Seneca, who, like the Christians, derided the gods or 'demons,' but himself, like the Christians, believed in one God.²

In tracing the origin of error, he makes the following explicit recognition :

'Since we often see that the worshippers of other gods themselves confess and acknowledge the one Supreme God, what pardon can they hope for their impiety who do not acknowledge the worship of Him of whom man may not be altogether ignorant? For both in swearing and in expressing a wish, and in giving thanks, they do not name Jupiter, or a number of gods, but God ; so entirely does the truth of its own accord break forth by the force of nature, even from unwilling breasts.'³

On the same subject, he gives an exact definition of the value in a Christian's estimation of popular heathen religion :

'Those worshippers of fragile images, however foolish they may be inasmuch as they place heavenly things in things which are earthly and corruptible, yet retain something of wisdom and may be pardoned, because they hold to the chief function of man, if not in reality, yet still in their purpose ; since, if not the only, yet certainly the greatest difference between men and the beasts consists in religion.'⁴

The false religions take their rise in Ham, the father of Chanaan, 'since its prince and founder did not receive from his father the worship of God, being cursed by him ; and thus he left to his descendants ignorance of the divine nature.'⁵ Other causes subsequently contributed to the spreading and differentiating of various forms of heathenism. We are bound, however, to suppose, in view of what Lactantius says elsewhere, that the 'ignorance' of which he speaks was not really complete.

In treating of the false wisdom of philosophers, Lactantius

¹ Lactant. *Instt.* i. vii.

² *Ib.* xvi.

³ *Ib.* ii. i. 'Cum ipsos deorum cultores sæpe videamus Deum summum et confiteri et prædicare, quam sibi veniam sperare possunt impietatis suæ, qui non agnoscunt cultum eius quem prorsus ignorari ab homine fas non est? Nam et cum iurant et cum optant, et cum gratias agunt, non Iovem aut deos multos, sed Deum nominant : adeo ipsa veritas, cogente natura, etiam ab invitis pectoribus erumpit.'

⁴ *Ib.* iii. 'Isti fragilium cultores, quamvis sint inepti, quia cœlestia constituunt in rebus corruptilibus atque terrenis, aliquid tamen sapientiæ retinent, et habere veniam possunt, quia summum hominis officium, etsi non reipsa, tamen proposito retinent : siquidem hominum atque mutorum, vel solum, vel certe maximum in religione discrimen est.'

⁵ *Ib.* xiv. 'Quoniam princeps eius et conditor cultum Dei a patre non accepit : itaque ignorantiam divinitatis minoribus suis reliquit.'

asserts that some of the philosophers—*e.g.* Euclid, Seneca, some Stoics, Epicurus—rightly discerned the nature of the chief good.¹ He quotes, too, the instances of historical heroes—Menœceus, Codrus, Curtius, and the two Mures—as showing that the heathen must have had some idea of immortality; ‘and,’ he adds, ‘although they were ignorant of the life of immortality, yet the reality itself did not escape their notice.’² Why, then, with so much knowledge to go upon did they fail so disastrously? Those who recognised the superiority of soul to body failed, because even they ‘have referred it [the chief good] to this life, which has its ending with the body,’ and so doing, ‘they have gone back to the body, to which the whole of this time which is passed on earth has reference.’³ But the practical result of philosophy as an influence is failure: ‘It appears that philosophy is altogether false and empty, since it does not prepare us for the duties of justice, nor strengthen the obligations and settled course of man’s life.’⁴ In accordance with this statement is the complete scorn which Lactantius pours on Socrates,⁵ and which is in strong contrast with his treatment of Seneca; in connexion with which it is impossible not to draw attention to a like rashness in the positiveness with which he ridicules notions which are now commonplaces of physics.⁶

In the book on true Wisdom and Religion the writer takes a rigorous view of the state of the heathen, which it is difficult to reconcile with what he says elsewhere: ‘Nor will the worshippers of the gods escape the penalty of everlasting death.’⁷ On the other hand, he speaks of Zeno’s knowledge of the Logos: ‘Of this divine speech not even the philosophers were ignorant, since Zeno represents the Logos as the arranger of the established order of things, and the framer of the universe.’⁸

¹ Lactant. *Instt.* III. xii. : *e.g.* ‘Intellexit [Euclides] profecto quæ sit natura summi boni.’

² *Ib.* ‘Qui tametsi nescierunt immortalitatis vitam, res tamen eos non fefellit.’

³ *Ib.* ‘Quoniam illud [summum bonum] ad hanc vitam retulerunt quæ cum corpore terminatur, ad corpus revoluti sunt, cuius est hoc omne tempus quod transigitur in terra.’

⁴ *Ib.* xiii. ‘Apparet falsam et inanem esse omnem philosophiam, quia nec instruit ad iustitiæ munera, nec officium hominis rationemque confirmat.’

⁵ *Ib.* xx.

⁶ *Ib.* xxiv.

⁷ *Ib.* IV. iv. ‘Neque cultores deorum pœnam sempiternæ mortis effugient.’

⁸ *Ib.* ix. ‘Hunc sermonem divinum ne philosophi quidem ignoraverunt; siquidem Zeno rerum naturæ dispositorem atque opificem universitatis λόγον prædicat.’

In the same book¹ he speaks of the foretelling of our Lord's Passion and Resurrection by the Sibyls. It may be noticed as strange that, with his knowledge of Greek philosophy, Lactantius should not refer in this connexion to Plato's remarkable statement in the *Republic*.²

Lastly, Lactantius declares that 'It is easy to show that almost the whole truth has been divided by philosophers and sects.' And again:

'The whole truth has been comprised by them in separate portions. Plato said that the whole world was made by God: the prophets speak the same. . . . The Stoics say that the world, and all things which are in it, were made for the sake of men: the sacred writings teach us the same thing. . . . Aristo asserted that men were born to the exercise of virtue; we are also reminded of and learn the same from the prophets. . . . Pherecydes and Plato contended that souls were immortal; but this is a peculiar doctrine in our religion.'³

So Zeno's conception of Hades is the same as that 'shown' by the prophets. And in order to confirm his argument on the nature of the soul, he states that he prefers to allege, 'not the testimony of the prophets . . . but rather . . . those whom they who reject the truth cannot but believe,'⁴ viz. the heathen writers.

The opinion of Christian antiquity with regard to the treatment of heathen religion and philosophy is usually held to take two directions. The Church of Alexandria was definitely sympathetic. Hitherto we have dealt with representative writers other than Alexandrian. Some of them are at times fiercely antagonistic, especially when they are confronted with the practical result of Gentile teaching in errors of faith or morals. But all, without exception, are seen to recognise an underlying truth; they discern that which perhaps the fiercest of the antagonists described as the 'general feeling with which God was pleased to endow the soul.'⁵

¹ Lactant. *Instt.* iv. xviii. xix.

² Plato, *Rep.* 362 A.

³ Lactant. *Instt.* vii. vii. 'Facile est docere pene universam veritatem per philosophorum sectas esse divisam. . . . Particulatim veritas ab his tota comprehensa est. Factum esse mundum a Deo, dixit Plato: idem prophetae loquuntur. . . . Hominum causa mundum et omnia quæ in eo sunt esse facta Stoici loquuntur: idem nos divinæ litteræ docent. . . . Ad virtutem capessendam nasci homines Ariston disseruit: idem nos monemur ac discimus a prophetis. . . . Immortales esse animas Pherecydes et Plato disputaverunt: hæc vero propria est in nostra religione doctrina.'

⁴ *Ib.* xiii. 'Eos potius quibus istos, qui respuunt veritatem, credere sit necesse.'

⁵ Tert. *De Anim.* ii. '[publicus sensus] quo animam Deus dotare dignatus est.'

writ
led
us.
and
stitu
anci
Fath
phil
Gosp

has
deal
stud
the g
soph
but r
The
to a
woul
phil
of su
migh
incl
of vi
alone
Chris

C
of Pa
of th
thing
himse
the n
fall i
parat
He e
Gree
right

1 C
2 E
4 J
5 S
ἀέννασι
6 J
λήψω
στικού
οὐκ εἰς

It has seemed convenient to consider the Alexandrian writers apart from the others. For various reasons they were led as a body to take a different view of the question before us. They formed, in fact, a school of Christian philosophy; and although no doubt the rise of the later Neoplatonism constituted a temptation of no little magnitude to disparage the ancient philosophies, yet, on the whole, the Alexandrian Fathers seem to have eagerly recognised the work which those philosophies had done in preparing the Gentile world for the Gospel.

St. Gregory Thaumaturgus in his panegyric¹ on Origen has left us a vivid description of his great master's method in dealing with his scholars. Applicable obviously to intelligent students, it tended at once to draw out their sympathies by the generous recognition of all that was good in the philosophical studies of Alexandria as being not merely permissible but necessary for the completeness of the Christian equipment. The Catechetical School at Alexandria has been compared² to a denominational college in a secular university; but it would appear to be more true to say that it was one of the philosophical schools which were the regular establishments of such centres as Alexandria.³ To the casual observer it might appear indistinguishable from them, save for a certain inclination to make its ethics culminate in the practical nature of virtue. But on this one point all else turned; and this alone involved the unique supremacy of Theology in the Christian school, to which all other teaching was subservient.

CLEMENT of Alexandria was almost certainly the pupil of Pantænus, and certainly the occupant of his chair as head of the school. He has been described as being 'above all things a missionary';⁴ and in this capacity he proposes to himself not to destroy the old, but to reconcile the old with the new. 'There is one river of Truth; but many streams fall into it on this side and on that.'⁵ Philosophy is 'a preparatory training for the enlightened man—the true Gnostic.' He even asserts that 'at one time philosophy justified the Greeks,' though 'not conducting them to that entire righteousness to which it is ascertained to co-operate.'⁶ So

¹ *Orat. Paneg. in Orig.* vi. vii. xiii. xiv.

² Bigg, *Bampton Lectures*, p. 41.

³ *Ib.* p. 43.

⁴ *Ib.* p. 47.

⁵ *Strom.* I. v. μία μὲν οὖν ἡ τῆς ἀληθείας ὁδός· ἀλλ' εἰς αὐτὴν, καθάπερ εἰς ἀένναον ποταμὸν, ἐκρέουσι τὰ ρεῖθρα ἄλλα ἄλλοθεν.

⁶ *Ib.* I. xx. συναίτιον φιλοσοφίαν καὶ συνεργὸν λέγοντες τῆς ἀληθοῦς κατὰ-λήψεως, ζήτησιν οὖσαν ἀληθείας, προπαιδεῖαν αὐτὴν ὁμολογήσομεν τοῦ γνωστικοῦ . . . καίτοι καὶ καθ' ἐαυτὴν ἐδικαίου ποτὲ καὶ ἡ φιλοσοφία τοὺς Ἕλληνας, οὐκ εἰς τὴν καθόλου δὲ δικαιοσύνην εἰς ἣν εὕρισκεται συνεργός.

the true Gnostic 'applies himself to the subjects [of whatever kind] that are a training for knowledge, taking from each branch of study its contribution to the truth.'¹ Clement, like other Christian writers, in tracing the degeneration of worship into idolatry, sees in Deut. iv. 19 an indication that 'the nations' were originally intended by God to worship the host of heaven, 'that they might not become altogether atheistical, and so utterly perish.'² But for the popular contemporary worship with its unspeakable defilements Clement has condemnation strong enough. 'Atheists,' he cries; 'I call those atheists who know not the true God and pay shameless worship,' &c.³ The outcome of philosophy is not to be sought here. Speaking of Christ preaching to Greek as well as Jew in Hades, he says: 'To those that were righteous according to philosophy, not only faith in the Lord but also the abandonment of idolatry were necessary.'⁴ Like many other early writers, Clement believes that the heathen 'stole' their fragments of truth—or at least some of them—from the Jewish revelation, and applies to them our Lord's description of the thieves and robbers.⁵ But this does not seem to represent his final opinion; clearly it is only a partial account; perhaps a mere repetition of a commonplace of the schools. We feel we are listening to his own convictions when he speaks of 'a certain divine influence instilled into all men';⁶ or of 'certain scintillations of the divine word, which [albeit "at most"] the Greeks have received.'⁷ 'Perchance, too, philosophy was given to the Greeks directly and primarily, till the Lord should call the Greeks also: for this was a schoolmaster to bring the Hellenic mind, as the law the Hebrews, to Christ.'⁸ It would, however, be very rash to

¹ *Strom.* VI. x. τοῖς εἰς γνῶσιν γυμνάζουσιν αὐτὸν προσανακεῖται, παρ' ἐκάστου μαθήματος τὸ πρόσφορον τῇ ἀληθείᾳ λαμβάνουν.

² *Ib.* VI. xiv. ἔδωκε μὲν [ὁ Θεός] φιλοσοφίαν αὐτῶ· ἀλλὰ πρὸ τῆς πίστεως· ἔδωκε δὲ τὸν ἥλιον καὶ τὴν σελήνην καὶ τὰ ἀστροὶ εἰς θρησκείαν· ἃ ἐποίησεν ὁ Θεὸς τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, φησὶν ὁ νόμος, ἵνα μὴ τέλειον ἄθεοι γεγόμενοι, τελείως καὶ διαφθαρῶσιν.

³ *Cohortat. ad Gentes*, ii. ἀθέους εἰκότως ἀποκαλῶ τοὺτους, οἱ μὲν ὄντως ὄντα Θεὸν ἠγνωκασιν, παῖδιον δὲ . . . ἀναισχύντως σέβουσιν.

⁴ *Strom.* VI. vi. τοῖς κατὰ φιλοσοφίαν δικαίοις οὐχ ἡ πίστις μόνον εἰς τὸν Κύριον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ ἀποστῆναι τῆς εἰδωλολατρίας ἔδει.

⁵ *St. John* v. 8.

⁶ *Cohortat. ad Gentes*, vi. πᾶσι γὰρ ἀπαξάπλως ἀνθρώποις, μάλιστα δὲ τοῖς περὶ λόγους ἐνδιατρίβουσιν, ἐνέστακται τις ἀπόρροια θεϊκή.

⁷ *Ib.* vii. καὶ τὰ μάλιστα ἐναύσματά τινα τοῦ λόγου τοῦ θεοῦ λαβόντες Ἕλληνες.

⁸ *Strom.* I. v. τάχα δὲ καὶ προηγουμένως τοῖς Ἕλλησιν ἐδόθη τότε [ἡ φιλοσοφία] πρὶν ἢ τὸν Κύριον καλεῖσθαι καὶ τοὺς Ἕλληνας· ἐπαυδαγγέει γὰρ καὶ αὐτὴ τὸ Ἕλληνικόν, ὡς ὁ νόμος τοὺς Ἑβραίους εἰς Χριστόν.

conclu
myst
parati
merely
had p
Of

'he de
should
by the
repudia
critical

He
nists k
Law w
Gentile
tinguis
men, a
in the
Origen
ness of
ness: '
integru
followe
reward
perdere
tian wr
gods w
the valu
clear h
who we

The
however
Christia
Denunc
by men
love of p

¹ As I

² For

³ Greg

τῶν ἀρχαῖ
δυναμί μ
ἔχειν ἐδυνά

⁴ Bigg

⁵ *Ib.* p

⁶ Orig

conclude from Clement's use of phraseology drawn from the mysteries that he in any way accepted their rites as a 'preparatio evangelii.'¹ It is far more probable that he was merely making use of phrases which, whatever their origin, had passed into common language.²

Of ORIGEN's system, his pupil Gregory tells us that—

'he deemed it right for us to study philosophy in such wise that we should read with utmost diligence all that has been written, both by the philosophers and by the poets of old, rejecting nothing and repudiating nothing (for, indeed, we did not yet possess the power of critical discernment) except only the productions of the atheists.'³

He himself is described as teaching that heathen Platonists knew the Father and the Son by nature.⁴ The Natural Law was given as a law of progressive revelation for the Gentiles:⁵ it is νόμος of the Epistle to the Romans as distinguished from ó νόμος (in Rom. iii. 7); the law which binds men, angels, and all reasonable creatures. So when St. Paul, in the words of the Psalmist, finds 'none that doeth good,' Origen does not think the Apostle wished to deny the goodness of good deeds, but rather the perfection of their goodness: 'hoc est, a nullo eam [bonitatem] ad perfectum et ad integrum consummatam.'⁶ So, too, the Gentile who has followed the light of reason may not indeed attain the highest reward; but 'bonorum operum gloriam et honorem et pacem perdere penitus non [potest].'⁷ Origen, too, like other Christian writers, takes the view of the popular religion, that its gods were demons. The fact of his generous appreciation of the value of their philosophy makes it the more abundantly clear how he would deal as a missionary with individuals who were given to heathen worship.

The limited field which has thus been passed in review, however superficially, is sufficient to show how widely the Christianity of early days looked for the leading of God. Denunciation of idolatry there is in plenty. It was uttered by men who were actuated, not by a narrow bigotry, but by a love of purity and cleanness. They had been heathen them-

¹ As Bigg, *Bampton Lectures*, p. 91.

² For St. Clement's opinion of the mysteries see *Cohortatio ad Gentes*, ii.

³ Greg. Thaum. *Pan. Or.* xiii. φιλοσοφείν μὲν γὰρ ἤξιον, ἀναλεγομένους τῶν ἀρχαίων πάντα ὅσα καὶ φιλοσόφων καὶ ὑμνωδῶν ἐστὶ γράμματα πάση δυνάμει μηδὲν ἐκποιουμένους, μηδ' ἀποδοκιμάζοντας (οὐδέπω γὰρ οὐδὲ τὴν κρίσιν ἔχειν ἐδυνάμεθα) πλὴν ὅσα τῶν ἀθέων εἴη.

⁴ Bigg, *Bampton Lectures*, p. 171.

⁵ *Ib.* p. 207, and note, from which the subsequent remarks are quoted.

⁶ Orig. *In Rom.* iii. 3.

⁷ *Ib.* ii. 7.

selves, and they knew as we cannot now know, unless we learn it ourselves in heathen lands, the fact of human passions trained to unchecked indulgence under religious sanctions. 'But they knew that "to all men things familiar are dear. Therefore it is through things familiar that God leads them."' They endeavoured "to make the best of the nations of the earth, to make the best of the religions of the world, to understand them; to realize that, if Christianity supersedes all other religions, as it does, it supersedes them, not by excluding, but by including, all the elements of truth which each contains."'²

We, it may be, suffer from the conception essentially Puritan of a heathen world wholly bad.³ That is not the thought of men who had the best reason for knowing the heathen world at its worst. St. Augustine in a somewhat later day can distinguish between the members of the body of the Church and those who, although formally outside her, were yet actually belonging to her, were of her soul.⁴ He can see good arising out of mere heresy. 'Hæresis auctor mons est, ubi oves aliquando inveniunt pascua, sed de pluvia Dei, non de divitiis montis;'⁵ far more was that gracious rain to be expected in the heathenism which is less deadly than the disloyalty of heresy. And he tells us that idols are not to be destroyed against the will of their owners. Presumably such men are to continue to act up to the light that is in them. The true remedy is to convert them to the Faith.⁶

And this tradition of the Christian Church is never lost. We find the truths of natural religion strongly insisted upon by the theologians of the Middle Ages. 'Totus iste mundus sensibilis, secundum quamlibet sui partem est quasi propositio signans divina mirabilia.' 'Universus mundus iste sensibilis quasi quidam liber est scriptus digito Dei.'⁷ The truth found

¹ St. Chrysostom, quoted by Gore, *Sermon*, p. 36.

² Gore, *Sermon*, p. 42.

³ Liddon, *Christmas Sermons*, p. 57. 'St. Paul was taught . . . to sanction certain features of the thought and language of ancient Greece, while ignoring or condemning the rest. The position that all the thought, all the practices, all the usages, of the old heathen religions were equally bad, was never bluntly stated until some Puritan divines stated it in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries; Tertullian perhaps comes nearest doing it in the third.'

⁴ See Liddon's *Bampton Lectures* III. § II. 2, p. 126 (ed. 1890). The expression is often quoted; but the present writer has failed to trace the original of the reference.

⁵ *Opp.* v. 233 C.

⁶ *Serm., Opp.* v. 364 B-365.

⁷ St. Bonaventura and Hugo de St. Victor, quoted by Landriot, *Le Christ de la Tradition*, i. p. 193 (2).

a popular exponent in such as the painter of the Spanish Chapel in S. Maria Novella at Florence, where close on the dawn of the Renaissance we find that in a symbolic representation of the Arts and Sciences six out of the fourteen great men who represent them are old-world pagans.¹

The effect of the Incarnation, thus retrospective no less than prospective, is held to govern and control and sanctify every human aspiration. The Church's work has been to hand on loyally the tradition which in this respect she has received. It is an easy matter for one of no definite convictions to take a liberal view of any good which his superficial glance may have discovered in the almost infinite fancies of men's religions; he is under no restraints of belief or of loyalty. It is the task of the Church, while preserving an unshaken loyalty to Him whose faith she has to teach, fearlessly and out of obedience to that loyalty, to discover through the Spirit of knowledge how the Eternal Wisdom has been pleased 'by divers portions and in divers manners' to declare Himself by prophet and seer, by philosopher and poet, and how in sober truth

'As little children lisp and tell of Heaven,
So thoughts beyond their thoughts to those high bards were given.'²

No doubt the peril of heathenism is a fact; and so far it is a perfectly legitimate motive of missionary work. No one who is personally aware of the real social conditions of heathenism talks of its morality or of its happiness. These conditions tend inevitably to lead individuals to an acquiescence in evil which their natural moral sense allows to be wrong; and so far 'the multitudes of the heathen' do undoubtedly tend to 'perish in their ignorance.' But their perishing is due, not to their ignorance of a higher law, but to that acquiescence in present evil which such ignorance renders probable and easy. Their responsibility, their sinfulness, in the sight of the All-just is due, not to ignorance, but to the measure of wilfulness of which they are guilty owing to their acquiescence in evil; and the business of Christendom is under God to enlighten this ignorance.

This is a clear and direct claim on all who believe in the missionary vocation of the Church; but it is equally clearly not the primary motive of missionary work. That motive lies in the common brotherhood of all men in the one family of God, 'children of the same family, bought by the same

¹ See Ruskin, *Mornings in Florence*, iv. v.

² *Christian Year*: Third Sunday in Lent.

Lord.' That certainly is the leading motive of St. Paul's life. Emphatically, it is not primarily the degraded state of the heathen races as compared to the light in which Christians live, but it is the overwhelming claim asserted by the love of God, which drives him forth to preach the Gospel to those who know it not. 'Therefore,' he says, 'we both labour and suffer reproach, because we trust in the living God, Who is the Saviour of all men, specially of those who believe.'¹ It is a direct, positive motive, in entire contrast to negative fear for perishing heathen. It is found in the realization of the personal Saviour Who has loved him and given Himself for him; and then in the broadening sense that this redeeming love has broken down all traditional barriers, and claims every soul as its own. It is the love of Christ, and not, in the first place, the anger of the Judge, that constrains St. Paul. His own rescue is in itself a motive so strong as to obscure all other. He is not his own, he is the slave of Jesus Christ, and therefore he is a debtor to all who are claimed by Him. He is a debtor to the Greeks and to the Barbarians, to the wise and to the unwise.

The motive is self-renunciation, surely an adequate one; stern enough as a standard of self-discipline, but safer than anything else for work in which any standard lower than the highest is apt to be unexpectedly disastrous. And St. Paul found it adequate; 'necessity,' he calls it: ἀνάγκη μοι ἐτίκεται. 'Woe is me if I preach not the Gospel.'²

ART. IV.—THE ATHANASIAN CREED.

A Critical Dissertation on the Athanasian Creed, its Original Language, Date, Authorship, Titles, Text, Reception, and Use. By G. D. W. OMMANNEY, M.A., Prebendary of Wells. (Oxford, 1897.)

AT length, after more than twenty years of study and research (Pref. p. vi), Mr. Ommanney has been able to write the line, 'Opus finitum est: Deo gratias,' at the close of the work (p. 459) which he undertook at the suggestion of the late Dean Burgon (Pref. p. v). When an author has been engaged as long as a quarter of a century upon a book he cannot lay it down unmoved. The lover of literature, in such circumstances, will naturally think once more of Johnson's

¹ 1 Tim. iv. 10.

² 1 Cor. ix. 16.

frames
his Di
such a
heart
waters
pride,
patron
his all
various
experie
that he
Johnso
nasian
up to
history
be draw
authors
of Wat
on the
standar
Waterla
as, for i
tary asc
follow H
fessor S
entirely
tion, and
attention
has in th
our own
Paris, at
which ha
The first
dence, of
such a ve
to take e
person, n
do wisely
wishes to
as explain
reference
It is in th
Mr. Omm

frame of mind when he had accomplished the mighty task of his Dictionary. His celebrated letter to Lord Chesterfield is such a revelation of the man as must inspire and touch the heart of every honest author. The picture of his struggle in the waters of difficulty, the sturdy independence of his defensive pride, which would not be encumbered with the help of a patron when he had got at last to land, the sacred pathos of his allusion to the solitude of his bereavement, appeal in various ways to our feelings.¹ Mr. Ommanney may justly experience something of the honest pride, while we trust that he has been spared such a measure of the hindrances, of Johnson. His work, as a critical dissertation on the Athanasian Creed, is what it is intended to be—a complete account up to date of the authorities and documents on which the history of the Creed rests, and of the conclusions which may be drawn from them in regard to its original language, date, authorship, titles, reception, and use. The permanent value of Waterland's great work must, of course, assist any writer on the subject. But it necessarily falls short of our present standard of knowledge; and Mr. Ommanney has re-examined Waterland's statements and conclusions, and in some points—as, for instance, in regard to the authorship of the Commentary ascribed to Venantius Fortunatus—has been unable to follow him. Something, too, Mr. Ommanney owes to Professor Swainson's work on the Creeds, though he differs entirely from that author's theories on the origin, construction, and date of the *Quicumque*. He is entitled to respectful attention when he puts his own conclusions before us; for he has in the long course of his studies engaged in research in our own public libraries, and in the foreign collections at Paris, at Troyes, at Milan, and at Rome. The materials which have been thus amassed are divided into two parts. The first contains a very full account of documentary evidence, of the highest possible value for scholars, and written in such a very clear and interesting manner that we are inclined to take exception to our author's modest remark that 'any person, not largely endowed with the gift of patience, may do wisely to proceed at once to the second part; and if he wishes to examine the grounds of any particular conclusion as explained in the first, he will be able to do so by means of reference to the list of contents and the foot notes' (Pref. p. vi). It is in the second part that we find the conclusions which Mr. Ommanney has reached upon all the chief vexed questions

¹ Boswell's *Life* (ed. Napier), i. 209-13.

of the *Quicunque*. In an appendix the text of about a dozen important documents is given. The usefulness of the whole work is greatly assisted by the excellently arranged list of contents, by the practical service of foot notes, and by two indices, one of general matter and the other of manuscripts classified according to contents and locality, both compiled with much care by the Rev. C. E. Plumb, the present Principal of St. Stephen's House at Oxford. The volume which is now placed before the reader comprises, together with much additional matter, the substance of Mr. Ommanney's two previous books on 'recent theories' and the 'early history' of the Athanasian Creed.¹ To these valuable contributions to the cause of the Catholic Faith must be added a very useful pamphlet, if we are to take the full measure of Mr. Ommanney's services.²

I. We will follow the lines marked out by Mr. Ommanney, and look first at his classification of documentary evidence. This opens with a collection of passages in ancient authors or documents which contain express references to the Creed, or quote it, or adopt its language. These are thirty-five in number; and while we have experienced the greatest enjoyment in examining them, and in observing the style of modest self-effacement which is adopted in putting the results of such industry before us, it is obvious that we can only comment on one or two of the passages selected. We note that many of them, especially those of a later date, are selected from a mass of similar authorities. The earliest writings quoted are two fragments of Avitus, Bishop of Vienne (A.D. 490-518). He can be with good reason quoted as a witness to the existence and authoritative acceptance of the *Quicunque* in his day (p. 2). Among the allusions in early sermons one of the most important in the controversy is a fragment contained in an eighth-century manuscript, written in Lombardic characters and comprising an ancient collection of canons. It has been commonly called the Colbertine MS. of the Athanasian Creed, a description which

¹ *The Athanasian Creed: an Examination of Recent Theories respecting its Date and Origin.* With a Postscript referring to Professor Swainson's Account, &c.

Early History of the Athanasian Creed: the Results of some Original Research upon the Subject. With an Appendix containing Four Ancient Commentaries, three of which are now printed for the first time. (London, 1880.)

² *The S.P.C.K. and the Creed of St. Athanasius* (London, 1884). This is noticed in terms of high commendation in the *Church Quarterly Review*, No. 36, pp. 393-6.

is acc
cerned
of Co
Omman
Dr. L
script
contra
discov
preach
not se
tention
faith r
other v
which
Florus
interes
been a
already
was fir
men o
taking
Psalter
splendi
acknow
Reeves
which r
Irish a
to whic
opportu
who de
Christi
tria sym
concili
struction
fidei de
extract
on the
that eac
prayer,
learned
our Lor
Upo

¹ *Hun*
from the
Lyons edi

is accurate enough so far as the epithet Colbertine is concerned ; for the manuscript originally belonged to the library of Colbert, who was the minister of Louis XIV. But Mr. Ommanney confidently opposes the late Dr. Swainson, and Dr. Lumby who followed him, in supposing that in the manuscript we have the germ of the Creed. He maintains, on the contrary, that the manuscript, which, from the place of its discovery, he calls the Trèves fragment, is a sermon, probably preached in the sixth century, upon the Creed, and we do not see how the arguments by which he supports this contention can be refuted (pp. 4-12). Passing over a confession of faith made by a Bishop of Worcester in A.D. 798, and some other valuable testimony, we will refer to a piece of testimony which was unknown to Waterland. This is a letter from Florus the deacon to Hyldrad the abbot, and is of great interest and importance, because it proves that the Creed had been admitted into Psalters for some considerable time already in the first half of the ninth century. This letter was first edited in 1828, and shows us one of the most learned men of the day looking upon the Creed as appropriately taking its place, with other accredited materials, in the Psalter (pp. 21-3). For the sake of paying tribute to the splendid learning of the ancient Irish Church, and by way of acknowledging the debt which scholars owe to Bishop Reeves, we must say that an account is given of the Irish MS. which records a curious tradition about the Creed, written in Irish and in Latin (pp. 33-5). The last piece of testimony to which we will refer is late, but we would fain take the opportunity of bringing it to the notice of our clerical readers who do not know the immense suggestiveness of the *Vita Christi* of Ludolphus, the Carthusian of Saxony. 'Sunt tria symbola,' he says, 'primum apostolorum, secundum Niceni concilii, tertium Athanasii ; primum factum est ad fidei instructionem, secundum ad fidei explanationem, tertium ad fidei defensionem' (p. 46). That terse and pregnant little extract is a sample of the most fruitful, devout commentary on the 'Life' of the Gospels that we know ; and we can add that each chapter of the work concludes with a beautiful prayer, and that Dean Church said that Ludolphus 'had learned what it was to realize to himself the way in which our Lord conversed with men.'¹

Upon turning to the evidence of canons and injunctions of

¹ *Human Life and its Conditions*, p. 192. Mr. Ommanney quotes from the Venetian edition of Ludolphus, published in 1581. In the Lyons edition of 1644 the passage quoted occurs on p. 708.

ecclesiastical authority the earliest document for our purpose is an 'Epistola Canonica,' a kind of episcopal Charge issued apparently in the early part of the sixth century in some North Italian diocese. Mr. Ommanney has himself inspected the original manuscript (p. 51), and accounts for Waterland's silence upon the subject by pointing out that the book of the great Archdeacon of Middlesex was written a few years before the Ballerini drew attention to this piece of evidence (p. 52). Even of the celebrated canon of Autun, which comes next, Waterland spoke with hesitation, as its authenticity was not in his day so firmly established. We know now that the two collections in which this canon is preserved cannot have been compiled later than the close of the eighth century, and, indeed, Mr. Ommanney is able to show that the Herovall collection must be placed between A.D. 721 and 770, and the Angers collection in the earlier part of that century, or even in the latter part of the preceding century (pp. 53-5). The care bestowed upon the estimate of the exact significance of this canon will, we venture to think, call forth the ungrudging admiration of every reader (pp. 52-66). Among the rest of the materials under this head we will only mention those witnesses which illustrate the history of the Creed in the English Church. These are three synodical injunctions issued in the thirteenth century by episcopal authority in the dioceses of Worcester, Durham, and Exeter, and an interesting form of faith in the old Sarum 'Ordo ad Visitandum Infirmum' (pp. 89-92).

The manuscript copies of the Creed which are now extant, or which, though now lost, are known to have existed, are exceedingly numerous. Although Mr. Ommanney finds it to be sufficient for his purpose to notice only what he calls a very few comparatively, his list contains the account of twenty-seven manuscripts. The earliest of these is at Milan, in the Ambrosian library. Muratori supposed it to be earlier than the eighth century, and no palæographical authority has placed it in a later century. It is apparently written in an Irish hand, and reached Milan from St. Columban's famous monastery at Bobbio (pp. 93-7). Mr. Ommanney has twice inspected the manuscript, and points out an inaccuracy of Muratori's transcript, which misled Waterland (p. 96). We must not pass over the manuscript which is put in the tenth place of the list. It is that which has commonly been called the Utrecht Psalter, which possesses some unique features among extant manuscript Psalters, and which has had a remarkable history in connexion with the modern controversy about the Creed. In the face of the highest modern palæographical authorities

it is in
Psalte
moder
us to
Omm
half o
that i
as the
Psalte
Recul
note t
Englis
Germa
Ethels
which
Corpus
Englan
another
another
library
Conque
Univer
written
Christi
the end
and on
tury, a
it to th
seems t
he nam
specim
the Cre
elevent
collecti
treatise
countri
The
of the
noticing
importa
Ommar
commen
buted to
Mr. Om

it is impossible any longer to maintain, with Ussher, that this Psalter is as old as the time of Gregory I., although the modern scholars differ too much among themselves to enable us to derive a positive date from their opinions. Mr. Ommanney's own conclusion is that it belongs to the first half of the ninth century. We acknowledge with reluctance that it is only evidence of the frailest description which serves as the basis of the opinion that Queen Bertha brought this Psalter from Gaul to Kent, and gave it to the monastery of Reculver (pp. 122-5). Under this head, again, we will briefly note the manuscripts which are specially connected with the English Church. They are a Psalter which was written in Germany between 817 and 850, generally known as King Ethelstan's Psalter, and now in the British Museum; a Psalter which probably belongs to the year 883, in the library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge; a Psalter written in England early in the tenth century, in the British Museum; another belonging to the middle of that century at Lambeth; another of the second half of the century, in the cathedral library at Salisbury; another shortly before the Norman Conquest, probably written at Canterbury, and now in the University Library at Cambridge; another slightly later, written probably at Worcester, and preserved at Corpus Christi College, Cambridge; another written at Winchester at the end of the eleventh century, now in the British Museum; and one in the Bodleian Library belonging to the tenth century, and written in Italy. The Bodleian catalogue assigns it to the eleventh century, and to this opinion Mr. Ommanney seems to defer in his text (p. 164), though in his list (p. xi) he names the previous century. The list from which these specimens are taken illustrates the early use and reception of the Creed in the Western Church from the eighth to the eleventh century. 'They are found in books of various kinds, collections of canons, of formularies of the faith and dogmatic treatises, and Psalters, and the Psalters are typical of various countries, Gaul, Germany, Italy, and England' (pp. 93-165).

The chapter on the existing commentaries or expositions of the Creed deals, as we pointed out in 1880, when we were noticing one of Mr. Ommanney's earlier books, with a very important branch of the subject, and one in which Mr. Ommanney has rendered conspicuous service.¹ Of these commentaries the earliest and of great interest is that attributed to Venantius Fortunatus by Muratori and Waterland. Mr. Ommanney, however, considers that 'at least one im-

¹ *The Church Quarterly Review* for July 1880, No. 20, p. 523.

portant discrepancy' between this document and the work of Venantius Fortunatus on the Apostles' Creed prevents us from regarding them as written by the same person. He concludes from external evidence that the commentary is older than the ninth century (p. 169), and an examination of the internal evidence, upon which also the late Professor Heurtley bestowed much pains, leads our author to the early part of the seventh or the close of the sixth century for the composition of the work (p. 176). An account of the history of the manuscript, and its printed editions, is added (pp. 176-184). The labour which Mr. Ommanney has expended on the 'Oratorian' commentary is much greater than a careless reader would infer from the account on pp. 188-95, but no one can fail to appreciate the list of patristic identifications on p. 188, in spite of the author's modest way of introducing them. Among the other commentaries which are noticed are an interrogative commentary in the British Museum, written in England in the twelfth century (p. 234), a commentary of the thirteenth century belonging to Merton College, Oxford (p. 238), and others connected with the names of Alexander Necham, Hereford Cathedral, Alexander Hales, Richard Rolle, the famous Yorkshire hermit, and the Wycliffites (pp. 241, 246, 248, 250, 253).

With a short account of the versions of the Creed we shall close our review of the first part of Mr. Ommanney's work. Up to this point we have noticed only the Latin copies of the Creed. Four different Greek versions of the Creed exist. Mr. Ommanney is disposed to trace the first of these to the hand of a member of the Greek Church in Southern Italy at the end of the eleventh century, when attempts began to be made for effecting the reunion of East and West (p. 274). The second appears to have emanated from the Latin Church in Constantinople in the thirteenth century (p. 278). But it is the third Greek version which is the most important. It was written, it seems, for those adherents of the Latin Church who loved Greek, and it has had some influence upon our Prayer Book translation. Mr. Ommanney places it in the south of Italy or Sicily, and assigns it to the thirteenth century at the latest (pp. 292-3). The fourth version was edited by Ussher from a Horology of Greek hymns owned by a Constantinopolitan monk, and departs more widely from the Latin than the other three (p. 293). The English versions deservedly come next, and take their place in the history of the Prayer Book. The earliest of these versions is preserved in the Bodleian Library, and is composed in metre and rhyme. It

has be
place
thinks
colnsh

Th
unkno
was o
cans,
reign.
except
comm
when
dayly
Manu
few ye
details
tion of
piled f
the La
version
Spanis
on our
manne
and we
than th
minds
upper
tury t
ancest
queror

II.
tion th
pains i
industr
We ha
we may
fairness

1 W
there ar
what ma
son's *N*
Peacock
is bound
on the s
from thi
of the C

has been dated about 1240 by Mr. Oliphant, who gives it a place in his work on *Old and Middle English* (p. 302), and thinks that it was written in the northernmost part of Lincolnshire (pp. 304-5).¹

The next version, now printed for the first time, is of unknown authorship, but Mr. Ommanney concludes that it was owned by, if not written in, a community of Franciscans, and that it belongs to the beginning of Edward III.'s reign. It is in the British Museum (pp. 305-8). With the exception of the Wycliffite version mentioned among the commentaries, no other English version appeared till 1539, when 'the Symbole or Crede of the great doctour Athanasius dayly red in the Church' was issued in Bishop Hilsey's *Manual of Prayers*, and a similar version was published a few years afterwards (pp. 309-10). We shall not go into the details from which Mr. Ommanney concludes that the translation of 1549, which in substance we still use, was probably compiled from several different sources, chief among them being the Latin text as in use at that time, and the third Greek version as printed in 1479 (p. 318). The German and the Spanish versions (pp. 320, 330) call for no special criticism on our part, though we note the thoroughness of Mr. Ommanney's work even in the subordinate parts of his subject, and we will not say more upon the French versions (p. 322) than that many of them were written, as Mr. Ommanney reminds us, in England for the devotional requirements of the upper classes, 'who continued as late as the fourteenth century to speak the language of their French or Norman ancestors who had come to our shores with William the Conqueror' (p. 326).

II. We trust that we have led our readers to the conviction that Mr. Ommanney is a scholar who has spared no pains in the collection of evidence, and whose accuracy and industry elude all his modest efforts to cast a veil over them. We have now to see him as the judge of his materials, and we may say at once that he shows caution and exceeding fairness towards those who have drawn other conclusions, two

¹ We are told in the *Spectator* of November 15, 1890, p. 713, that there are really three dialects in Lincolnshire, spoken respectively in what may be called North, Mid, and South Lincolnshire. Lord Tennyson's *Northern Farmer* is written in the second dialect, while Miss Peacock's *Tales* are an example of the first. The region of this dialect is bounded on the west by the Trent, on the east by the Ancholme, and on the south it hardly extends below Gainsborough. It is apparently from this region that Mr. Oliphant supposes the earliest English version of the Creed to have emanated.

qualities which have been very far indeed from being conspicuous in more than one of the scholars who have engaged in controversy on this subject. We shall notice his own conclusions in order, and then conclude with our own reflections upon the subject.

There is no difficulty in arriving at a conclusion upon the language in which the Creed was originally composed. Mr. Ommanney quotes the argument of Waterland as conclusive upon this point.

'The style and phraseology of the Creed, its early reception among the Latins, while unknown to the Greeks, the antiquity and number of the Latin manuscripts and their agreement for the most part with each other, and the disagreement of the Greek copies, all concur to demonstrate that this Creed was a Latin composition rather than a Greek one, and as to any other language besides these two, none is pretended' (p. 334).

To this Mr. Ommanney adds the further observation that the terminology of the Creed is largely borrowed from Western Fathers. If it be urged that the Creed, as Serarius said, was written by St. Athanasius in Latin, Mr. Ommanney has a reply which is fatal to the contention (p. 335)—simply that St. Augustine was not baptized until some years after the death of St. Athanasius. Either the Creed was based on St. Augustine's language, or that Father used the phrases of the Creed. The first conclusion is, on the question of date, impossible, if the Creed was written in Latin by St. Athanasius; the second would be fatal to a Latin Athanasian version, for St. Augustine does not mention the Creed as a document of authority or the work of Athanasius. The conclusion, therefore, that the Creed was originally a Latin composition also enables us to say that St. Athanasius was not its author.

In determining the question of date there are external and internal points of evidence to be considered. Mr. Ommanney takes the documents, of which he has given such a good account, and, beginning with the first half of the ninth century, he traces the evidence upwards through each of the preceding centuries as far as it reaches (p. 336). He puts before us a most absolute and complete refutation of the theory that the Creed was not produced before the ninth century; for he shows that the Creed was quoted or referred to in the first half of that century as the work of St. Athanasius by several writers, that its use was canonically enjoined at this period in episcopal admonitions and Charges, that it was commonly found in Psalters at this time subjoined to the

Old an
upon it
was ex
of anti
a consi
in supp
fession
ancient
or in p
ancient
script o
that the
sixth ce
the fifth
tury co
which b
of the
Comme
to St. A
Creed w
evidenc
century
century
four pie
century
Creed m
internal
limits to
witness
date of
as the li
Creed w
the com
Augusti
waiving
and the

¹ In a printed text character from Greece while from so numerous manney's the Creed Bright's also *The*

Old and New Testament Canticles, and that a commentary upon it exists belonging to that date. That is to say, the Creed was extant and in a complete form, and regarded as a work of antiquity and authority (pp. 337-40). We have, however, a considerable amount of evidence from the eighth century in support of the antiquity of the Creed. An episcopal profession of faith (p. 340) quotes it as an authoritative and ancient document; four MSS. of this century contain it wholly or in part, the oldest of which is clearly a copy of a still more ancient MS. (p. 341). There is also an eighth-century transcript of the Trèves fragment which 'leads to the conclusion that the Creed could not have been drawn up later than the sixth century, but probably originated not after the middle of the fifth century' (p. 343). Lastly, there are two eighth-century commentaries on the Creed extant (p. 344), and one which belongs to the beginning of the eighth, if not to the end of the seventh century. The author of this, the Oratorian Commentary, says that ancient manuscripts ascribe the Creed to St. Athanasius. That is to say, in the seventh century the Creed was regarded as an ancient composition. Confirmatory evidence comes from other and various sources in the seventh century itself, pointing to a date not later than the fifth century for the production of the Creed. Lastly, there are four pieces of testimony which carry us through the sixth century, and bid us look for the origin of the Athanasian Creed not later than the middle of the fifth century. The internal evidence, to which we next proceed, sets well-defined limits to the approximate date, and corroborates the external witnesses. Mr. Ommanney fixes upon the year 434 A.D., the date of the first *Commonitorium* of St. Vincent of Lérins, as the limit of the period on its early side within which the Creed was composed. He is led to this by observing that the compiler of the Creed drew his materials partly from St. Augustine's writings and partly from the *Commonitorium*, waiving for the moment the question whether the *Quicumque* and the *Commonitorium* proceeded from the same hand.¹ Mr.

¹ In 1884 (the *Church Quarterly Review*, No. 36, pp. 376-7) we printed two lists of passages which illustrated the thoroughly patristic character of the terminology of the *Quicumque*. The parallel passages from Greek Fathers are more in number than might be supposed (p. 376), while from Latin Fathers it is only possible to make a typical selection, so numerous are the comparisons (p. 377). In connexion with Mr. Ommanney's remarks on the relation of St. Augustine's language to that of the Creed we may refer to 'St. Augustine and the *Quicumque vult*' in Dr. Bright's *Lessons from the Lives of Three Great Fathers*, p. 268; cf. also *The Incarnation as a Motive Power*, pp. 164-5.

Ommanney holds that the construction of the Creed, its treatment of the subject matter, and its style show that it was the product of one period and one mind, though constructed of materials drawn from a variety of sources (p. 349). He finds distinct traces of the terminology used by the orthodox in the Nestorian controversy, which was the principal subject of agitation at least till 448 (pp. 350-74). It is this last-named year which Mr. Ommanney is inclined to set as the later limit of his period of time, and he shows that the doctrine enshrined in the term Theotokos is distinctly expressed in the Creed, though the word itself is not used (p. 358).

When the question of authorship is approached the inquiry is necessarily hemmed in by the foregoing conclusions. The problem is to find a Latin theologian, who lived during the later Nestorian epoch and was conversant with its theology, and with the writings of St. Augustine. St. Hilary of Arles, who died in A.D. 449, cannot be said to meet these conditions in a very satisfactory way. Indeed, he owes the reputation of authorship more to the influence of Waterland's support than to the solidity of his claim. There is no positive proof of the fact, however probable it may be, that he was conversant with the writings either of St. Augustine or the Nestorian controversy. And, as Mr. Ommanney shows to demonstration, the attempt to prove that the 'symboli expositio ambienda' mentioned by St. Hilary's biographer is the Athanasian Creed completely breaks down on examination (p. 376). There remain three Latin theologians of the period who satisfy two of the required conditions, Cassian, Marius Mercator, and St. Vincent of Lérins. It must suffice for us to say that Mr. Ommanney has searched in vain in the works of Cassian and Mercator for any actual evidence of familiarity with St. Augustine's writings in identity or similarity of thought or language (p. 378). But he finds it in St. Vincent, and sets passages from the *Commonitorium* and from St. Augustine side by side to prove his point. St. Vincent, he says, is the only person in whom the three conditions can be proved to meet. He lived and flourished at the period of the Nestorian controversy, for he died A.D. 450; he was, as his *Commonitorium* shows, thoroughly conversant with that controversy and with St. Augustine's writings. Nor is this all, for Mr. Ommanney finds distinct traces of a connexion between the *Quicumque* and the *Commonitorium* in several remarkable coincidences of doctrinal terminology and idiomatic expression occurring in the two documents (p. 380). Mr. Ommanney does not say more than that it is 'highly

probably
he st
the co
that w
has ev
teachin
value o
amend
since w
'quod'

The
they fe
manus
Cathol
but be
not be
out, h
Creed
its ascr
its intr
Scriptu
tion' (C
has alw
is some
has nev
more o
are tru
as in C
to lea
be ret

¹ See
(8th ed.)
² *Lij*

'uselessn
his own
pillory.
the rule,
The wor
Vincenti
ness wh
surrende
still contr
by the
dealing
wish tha
English
³ *Ox*
Gore, M

probable' that St. Vincent was the author, and in so doing he stands in the honoured company of Antelmi, who won the commendation of the impartial Tillemont.¹ We confess that we are pleased with this conclusion, for although no one has ever been able to lessen our admiration for the clear teaching of the *Commonitorium*, and our sense of the practical value of the Vincentian canon, yet we have felt that some amends ought to be made to the memory of St. Vincent ever since we read the late Archbishop Magee's keen attack on his '*quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus*.'²

The titles of the Creed will not detain us long, though they form an essential feature of its history. In some early manuscripts it has no title, and in others it is called '*Fides Catholica*.' It was not ascribed to Athanasius by its author, but became associated with his name subsequently, apparently not before the seventh century (pp. 401-2). We may point out, however, with Mr. Ommanney that the claims of the Creed to our belief and esteem do not rest upon the fact of its ascription to Athanasius, but 'chiefly and primarily upon its intrinsic excellence as a faithful exposition of the great Scriptural and Catholic verities of the Trinity and Incarnation' (p. 405). And we should like to add that the *Quicunque* has always been regarded as a Creed, because we fear that it is sometimes rather invidiously pointed out that the *Quicunque* has never by itself been proposed for subscription, and has more of the character of a psalm than a Creed. These remarks are true enough, and may be made for a legitimate purpose, as in Canon Gore's Oxford House Paper.³ But if they are to lead to the conclusion that the *Quicunque* need not be retained they become a source of serious danger. Mr.

¹ See Harold Browne, *Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles*, p. 221 (8th ed.).

² *Life of Archbishop Magee*, ii. 102 sqq. The weakness and practical uselessness of the Vincentian rule was a favourite topic with him. In his own racy Irish way of talking he longed to get old Vincent into the pillory. His difficulties were that (i.) he had never been able to prove the rule, and (ii.), if true, he had never been able to prove anything by it. The word 'omnes' he could not satisfactorily explain. No doubt the Vincentian dogma is always open to criticism from that very absoluteness which gives it the charm and terseness and point. If we even surrender that advantage by admitting the necessary qualifications, it still contains an important truth. 'Consensus' is a really valuable thing by the admission of all sensible thinkers, yet more so when we are dealing with the fulfilment of a divine promise to guide into all truth. We wish that all who know the celebrated extract would read (even in an English version) the whole *Commonitorium*. It speaks for itself.

³ *Oxford House Papers*, No. xxii., 'The Athanasian Creed,' by C. Gore, M.A. (Longmans, London, 1897), p. 11.

Ommanney is exceedingly strong and good on this point, that 'the *Quicumque vult* has during the whole course of its history been received in the Western Church as a Creed' (p. 420), and the first evidence which shows this is supplied by the titles.

The text of the Creed is remarkably free from variants of importance, especially when we consider the great number of manuscripts which are still extant (p. 407). Mr. Ommanney notices the different readings with his usual care, and is able to point out an error in one of Muratori's collations (p. 419).

The last chapter deals with the reception and use of the Creed. It was received as a formulary of confession of faith before God with thanksgiving, and as an instrument of instruction. The first of these uses is attested by a vast number of manuscript Psalters from the eighth to the fifteenth centuries, and by the well-nigh continuous testimony of incidental historical notices (pp. 422-3). Mr. Ommanney marshals the facts about the recitation of the Creed in divine service, though he cannot determine with certainty the precise date when it began to be so used. That the Creed served as the basis of instruction is shown by the numerous existing commentaries (p. 436). It is difficult from such a mass of interesting materials as Mr. Ommanney puts before us in this chapter to specify details; but among the most attractive paragraphs we are inclined to place the accounts of the post-Reformation use and reception of the Creed in the Church of England (p. 429), its monastic use (p. 432), its spread in the various parts of Western Christendom (p. 439), among our Saxon forefathers (p. 450), and in the East (p. 458).

As we close Mr. Ommanney's really noble contribution to the study of the Athanasian Creed we must express our emphatic conviction that the substance of his conclusions ought to take their place at once in our theological manuals. If the novel views about the Creed which were broached by Professors Lumby and Swainson and Mr. Ffoulkes are shown to be directly contrary to the evidence of facts, as Mr. Ommanney claims to have shown them to be, it is time that in such a book as the S.P.C.K. Commentary on the Prayer Book the lumber of conjecture on the Athanasian Creed should be replaced by a correct historical summary. We have no doubt as to the person who should be asked to undertake it. Mr. Ommanney has produced the greatest work on the Athanasian Creed since the days of Waterland, and though we do not wish to say that Mr. Ommanney has exceeded the theological acumen of his great predecessor in this field of study,

we can
the livin
searches
Mr. Om
a simpl
commen

Our
There a
truths
by the
within
subject,
for all
Catholic
would u
take eve
explana
obtaine
guild ac
for the
paper, v
are unal
and the
way of
it belon
are glac
translat
also gla
diocese
condem
clergym
(p. 4), a
his cler
clergym
us to ju
For
not offer
by the
sermon

¹ *Help*
the Athar
² *The*
botham,
³ *The*
(S.P.C.K.)

we can say that the later book shows in every direction that the living scholar has had advantages in pursuing his researches to which the older divines were strangers, and that Mr. Ommanney is eminently qualified to cast his facts into a simple form with judicious impartiality. We earnestly commend these remarks to the authorities of the S.P.C.K.

Our concluding remark is concerned with a wider question. There are, we know, many persons who accept the two great truths of the Trinity and the Incarnation who are troubled by the language of the Athanasian Creed. It does not fall within Mr. Ommanney's scope, according to his plan of the subject, to deal with this difficulty. But for the clergy, and for all who have to do with the defence and extension of the Catholic Faith, this matter is of the utmost importance. We would urge upon all who have to cope with the difficulty to take every opportunity of circulating the full and satisfactory explanations of the language of the Creed which are to be obtained, to lend them to the educated to simplify them in guild addresses and in the pages of their parish magazines for the illiterate. We have already referred to Canon Gore's paper, which contains some excellent passages, though we are unable to give an unqualified approval to all his remarks, and though the paper is tinged with that curious academic way of looking at the matter which gives the series to which it belongs a somewhat unpractical tone. In particular we are glad to see that Canon Gore (p. 28) gives a revised translation, which will serve as a useful commentary. We also gladly refer to a letter addressed to a layman of his diocese by the Bishop of Edinburgh,¹ because the Bishop condemns 'the irregular and illegal remedy' by which a clergyman does as he pleases about the use of the Creed (p. 4), and has, we observe with satisfaction, ordered one of his clergymen to recite the Creed. We only refer to the clergyman's sermon on the subject to say that it appears to us to justify the Bishop's action.²

For circulation among ordinary Church people we have not often seen a simpler manual than six expository addresses by the Rev. J. H. Rawdon, M.A.,³ or a more excellent plain sermon than the late Dean Butler's on *The Faith once*

¹ *Helps from History to the True Sense of the Minatory Clauses of the Athanasian Creed.* By J. Dowden, D.D. (Edinburgh: Grant, 1897.)

² *The Athanasian Creed and Disbelief.* By the Rev. R. Winterbotham, M.A. (Edinburgh: St. Giles' Printing Company, 1897.)

³ *The Athanasian Creed.* By the Rev. J. H. Rawdon, M.A. (S.P.C.K., 1885.)

delivered to the Saints;¹ and for highly trained intellects there is Dr. Liddon's sermon on the life of faith and the Athanasian Creed.² With a word on one curious objection we will conclude. We have heard the point urged that, as we no longer repeat the Nicene anathema after the Creed in the Liturgy, so we might, in keeping with the toleration of the times, omit the clauses which cause distress to some in the *Quicumque*. One answer to this, at least, is that the Nicene anathema never formed an integral part of the Creed to which it belonged, as the clauses in question in the *Quicumque* undoubtedly do form. It is the duty of the Church to repeat the words of her Divine Head; or, rather, He now speaks by her the same words as He spoke on earth in the days of His flesh. And when the Church repeats the *Quicumque vult* she is to be understood to speak with all the fulness of meaning, and with all the qualifications of justice and mercy, with which Christ our Lord spoke; and she means what He meant, no more and no less, when He said, 'He that believeth not shall be damned.' That is to say, as we can never too often repeat, the difficulty presented by the minatory clauses has its roots not in the Prayer Book but in the Bible.

ART. V.—A GREAT SCHOOLMASTER SIXTY YEARS SINCE.

The Life and Letters of Dr. Samuel Butler, Head Master of Shrewsbury School, 1798–1836, and afterwards Bishop of Lichfield, in so far as they illustrate the Scholastic, Religious, and Social Life of England, 1790–1840. By his Grandson SAMUEL BUTLER, Author of *Erewhon*, *The Trapanese Origin of the Odyssey*, &c. Two vols., 8vo. (London, 1896.)

IT is not a little singular that so long a period should have been allowed to elapse between the death of the famous head master of Shrewsbury and the appearance of these two portly volumes. Few men have exercised a wider influence in their day than did Dr. Samuel Butler, through whose hands there passed the scholars who ruled half the great schools in England half a century ago; yet, so uncertain and capricious

¹ A sermon preached at St. Barnabas, Oxford, by the Rev. Canon W. J. Butler in 1884. (Oxford: Mowbray, 1884.)

² *University Sermons*, ii. 119. We may add references to *Lyra Apostolica*, No. 115; Mr. Otley's *Doctrine of the Incarnation*, ii. 276.

are th
may b
alread
who p
becaus
Penrh
eminer
his gra
Wheth
their s
suffers
of biog
within
the w
eight l
and w
Whole
injury
of the
the rep
each i
sponde
ad nam
sibly s
mind,
keener
more l
more t
inform
hope o
hence,
that a
little tr
If
standp
that th
pages
to the
ties of
of erud
over qu
play bi
praise t
afford

are the conditions which ensure posthumous fame that it may be questioned whether Dr. Samuel Butler's name is not already all but forgotten. It is the old story of the heroes who preceded Agamemnon. Dr. Arnold's memory is green because he found the indispensable *vates sacer* in Arthur Penrhyn Stanley; Dr. Samuel Butler would have been in eminent peril of passing into impenetrable obscurity had not his grandson erected this tardy memorial of his life and work. Whether these volumes will secure adequate recognition for their subject it is not very easy to forecast. Their author suffers from the chronic and apparently irrepressible malady of biographers, viz. the incapacity to reduce his subject-matter within reasonable bounds. From his preface we learn that the work has already been curtailed by one-third, yet the eight hundred closely printed pages here presented demand, and would easily have admitted, much further condensation. Whole pages of correspondence might still be excised without injury to Dr. Butler's memory, and to the infinite satisfaction of the reader. What useful purpose can possibly be served by the reproduction of three or four commencements of a letter—each in turn cancelled by the writer—to a nameless correspondent on some trivial occurrence, or by the record, *usque ad nauseam* of 'the small beer' of daily private life? Possibly some misgiving on this head has crossed the author's mind, but he satisfies himself by looking forward to the keener appreciation of a future and, we will fain hope, a more leisurely age. It is a bold thing to prophesy a life of more than two centuries for any new book; but Mr. Butler informs us that 'this book is written *fully as much*¹ in the hope of interesting Shrewsbury men two hundred years hence, as for those of the present generation, and if I think that a detail will age well, I shall not care about its being a little trivial or uninteresting at present' (i. 14).

If we regard the *Life and Letters* from the ordinary standpoint of criticism we find, apart from their prolixity, that they contain abundant stores of interest. The opening pages at once introduce us to a long-dead-and-buried world, to the Rugby days before Arnold was born; to such eccentricities of learning as Bentley and Porson, and that uncouth giant of erudition Dr. Parr; to the quarrels of Blomfield and Butler over questions of Greek scholarship; to the times of Greek-play bishops and pluralist clergy. Any tendency to overpraise the past is tempered by the insight Mr. Butler's pages afford into an age which unquestionably was coarser and

¹ Italics ours.

fiercer than our own; although we may still doubt whether we are better than our grandfathers when we remember the conditions under which they entered upon the battle of existence, and estimate how much of the improved environment which surrounds ourselves is due to the fidelity with which they performed the duties of their generation. If some of the questions over which they contended so fiercely seem to us little better than the squabbles of the big- and little- endians, it is possible that future ages may look with like amused wonder on some of the controversies of the present day.

Dr. Samuel Butler was born on January 30, 1774, at Kenilworth, and was an only child. In 1783 he was sent to Rugby, of which Dr. James was then head master, and, in defiance of the established Arnold cult, our author asserts that no subsequent head master so completely recreated the school as Dr. James did during his fourteen years of office, and that the monitorial system, for which Arnold has had all the credit, existed at Rugby in Dr. James's time. Walter Savage Landor, Carey (the translator of Dante), William Hill, afterwards Lord Berwick, and Apperley, well known in after years as 'Nimrod' of the *Sporting Magazine*, were among Butler's schoolfellows. If we may credit Nimrod's testimony Butler displayed such a genius for classics as showed that he was an instance of 'accidental variation.'

'When was Dr. Butler,' he asks, *φιλομάθης*? Not during the many years in which I slept in the same room with him at Rugby—fishing and novel and play reading at that period employing by far the greater part of his time. Then how did he get through the business of his class, or "form"? How were his exercises composed? How were his lessons construed and parsed? I will tell you how all this was performed. "Fetch me half a sheet of paper," he would say to myself, or to any other boy much lower in the school than himself, at the hour of awaking in the morning; when, taking some novel or play book from under his pillow, which he had been reading overnight, and using it as a desk, he would write off the best exercise of the day, and *play* (i.e. a holiday) *for Butler* would often be heard throughout the schools. Then his lessons: "Where is the place?" he would say to his neighbour, on joining his form ten minutes before a Greek play was to be read. Perhaps half a dozen words might be looked out in his lexicon, when the Greek book would be shut, and one more to his mind brought forth from his pocket. If "called up," however, there was *no mistake*. Now how this was done is quite beyond my comprehension' (pp. 10-11).

The case evidently defies classification, and can only be compared, in Nimrod's judgment, to the intuition displayed

by some sports introduced into the Collegiate career paragon

'I find Greek College, K. Bishop and too first M. Fellow

Such Butler's Shrewsbury were the predece trying for hung for comme was soc whom I received disciplin refined been no years—to the i fortunat Jeurdwir cipline—him 'Ja Butler; masters in the t ments to itself re mirable

'I sho without to no idea o for a mo with who VOL.

by some young foxhounds on their first field-day, or to some sportsmen's forecast of a fox's trail. Owing to an accidental introduction to Dr. Parr, young Butler was sent to St. John's College, Cambridge, instead of to Christ Church, Oxford, and commenced residence in October 1791. His undergraduate career is described by his biographer in the following brief paragraph:

'I find Mr. Butler was Browne Medallist, Latin Ode 1792-3 and Greek Ode 1794. He was Craven Scholar 1793, beating S. T. Cole-ridge, Keate, afterwards Head-Master of Eton, and Bethell, afterwards Bishop of Bangor. He graduated as fourth senior optime in 1796, and took the first Chancellor's Medal in the same year. He was first Members' Prizeman 1797 and 1798, and was elected Platt Fellow of St. John's, April 3, 1797' (i. 13).

Such distinction met with very questionable reward by Butler's appointment in 1798 to the head-mastership of Shrewsbury School. The fortunes of that ancient foundation were then at the very lowest ebb; and no wonder, for Butler's predecessor and his assistant 'used to amuse themselves by trying which could kick highest at a flitch of bacon that was hung for them in the kitchen to practise at.' When Butler commenced his duties hardly a single boy was left; but he was soon inundated by a crowd of town boys of all ages whom he was obliged to admit, 'though none of them had received any regular education.' To aid in reducing this undisciplined horde to order, in a school without a vestige of refined tradition or gentlemanly *esprit de corps*—there had been no regular school or discipline established for twenty years—the authorities at St. John's appointed Mr. Jeudwine to the irremovable position of second master. A more unfortunate selection could hardly have been made. Mr. Jeudwine was not only utterly deficient in maintaining discipline—'the boys could almost pull his coat tails and call him 'Jacky' to his face—but he could not agree with Dr. Butler; and for seven and thirty years the first and second masters addressed each other only by letter, writing generally in the third person, and formally presenting their compliments to one another. What such division of a house against itself really meant is well described in the following admirable paragraph:

'I should have been very glad to be able to pass this story over, but without touching on it (and I do so as lightly as I can) I can convey no idea of the difficulties which Mr. Butler had to face. Without for a moment raising the question who was in the main right, or with whom the quarrel began, and assuming the faults to have been

equal upon both sides, the mere fact of having a second whom he could not change, but with whom he could not, in any sufficient sense of the word, co-operate, must have gone near to making success impossible. That he should have triumphed in spite of unceasing antagonism within the school; that he should have so controlled himself for seven and thirty years as never once, that I have seen, to have been betrayed into angry or uncourteous language to his opponent; that he should have avoided all public scandal save what was inseparable from Mr. Jeudwine's complaints to the trustees—these things have filled me with an admiration which I am confident the reader will not be slow to share. Even though Dr. Butler had not changed the face of public school education from one end of England to the other, though he had never created a great school, and turned out a brilliant band of scholars, the foremost of whom no doubt in some respects surpassed their teacher—even though he had done nothing but command his temper so admirably for so many years, I should still have thought no pains I could bestow upon his memory so great as that memory deserved' (i. 41-2).

Heartily as we are disposed to concur in this eulogium of Butler's forbearance we fear his memory will be effectually buried amidst the huge amount of material in which his biographer enshrines it. Page after page of weary detail describing every item in the curriculum of Rugby under Dr. James from the daily time-table of the fifth and sixth forms to the most elementary studies of the lowest in the lower schools; lists of books suitable for school libraries, such as Sandford and Merton and the recondite Mrs. Trimmer; minute particulars of an unsuccessful candidature for the head-mastership of Rugby, including all the now useless correspondence over a fiasco too remote to be worthy of revival; endless scraps and fragments of a quarrel over Blomfield's 'review of Butler's *Æschylus*,' in which Monk also was involved—although the exact points at issue are still left in obscurity, and the reader must learn them, if he cares to do so, elsewhere—dreary extracts from Butler's ponderous letters upon minute points of technical scholarship, such as the correct delineation of the metres used in the choruses of Greek plays, the emendation of corrupt texts and the completion of imperfect ones, the exact place of the *ictus* in Greek iambics—matters of unquestionably scholastic importance, but needing to be dealt with by the handful rather than the bushel—such is the staple of large portions of these turgid volumes. Nor is even the degree of light vouchsafed us which brief but explanatory notes could and should have supplied. In short the correspondence, which fills three-quarters of the work, is not edited in the modern

sense of
Dr. Bu
criminal

But
vexatio
lowing
one, wh
my tho
was qu
ignorant
of burg
many o
rumour
credited
maintain
given to
who we
drunk a
to puni
on Butl
were ve
expelled
years af
on an a
had less
trustees
their dis
calumni
were rep
cised ove
writing

'A so
earth whi
many boy
share her
orchards,
true; tha
no maste
they some
if I disco
a habit of
happen at
other scho

An a
is relate

sense of the word, it is simply reprinted, letters to and from Dr. Butler, on every conceivable topic, being thrust indiscriminately before the reader.

Butler's earlier years at Shrewsbury were embittered by vexations to which he referred forty years later, in the following terms: 'a hard pill to digest, but truly a wholesome one, which brought me acquainted with mankind, and turned my thoughts from overweening vanity' (i. 46). The school was quickly inundated by a throng of undisciplined and ignorant lads from the age of sixteen downwards, the sons of burgesses, whom he was compelled to admit, as well as by many other pupils. The town offered many temptations; rumours of undue severity were soon spread, and too easily credited, in a place where no proper authority had been maintained for more than twenty years. Some colour was given to the prevailing gossip by the expulsion of two boys who went to the races without leave, and returned home drunk at eleven o'clock at night. When called on to submit to punishment they ran away, and one of them drew a knife on Butler's servant, who followed them. These youngsters were very properly secured, soundly flogged, and then expelled; and the example thus set was so effectual that six years afterwards Dr. Butler wrote, 'I have not since punished on an average six boys in a half-year, though I have never had less than from fifty to sixty boys.' In later years the trustees and more influential townsmen invariably upheld their distinguished head master's name against such unfounded calumnies. After some time had passed complaints of severity were replaced by charges that no effectual control was exercised over the boys' studies or play hours, and we find Butler writing to a parent under the date of February 14, 1826—

'A school of two hundred good boys would be a paradise upon earth which no master was ever happy enough to meet with. Among many boys there will be many dispositions, and we must have our share here as well as at other places. That boys sometimes rob orchards, and are always punished for it when discovered, is perfectly true; that they go out of bounds often without discovery, because no master can be in twenty places at once, is perfectly true; that they sometimes get liquor is perfectly true, and it is equally true that if I discover this I always severely punish it, and if I find a boy has a habit of the thing I dismiss him. That cases happen here which happen at no other school I must deny, and that more happen at other schools than at this I must confidently affirm' (i. 295).

An amusing example of the provoking ingenuity of boys is related in connexion with the complaint of an excise man

who made frequent use of a footpath through the school grounds: the poor man had a large bottle-nose, and the boys used to call him 'Nosey.' Strict orders were given that the objectionable name should not be repeated; but next day the excise man called on the Doctor angrier than ever. On his passing through the lane the boys had drawn up in two lines and gazed silently but intently upon his nose. The head boy was again summoned and sharply rebuked: 'You have no business to annoy this man; don't look at him.' Once more the man came, furious with indignation: as soon as he appeared every boy had covered his eyes with his hand till he had passed. 'What would you have me say?' asked the Doctor in despair; 'don't you see that they will obey and yet evade every order that I give them? Had you not better keep out of their way?' (i. 278).

It is difficult to repress a sigh of regret, as such pranks recall happy schoolboy days, now long past. If school life then was rougher and its code of honour varied from that which now prevails, we may yet discern abundant evidence of Butler's affectionate concern for the highest welfare of the boys placed under him, and of their hearty appreciation of his kindness. His letters display admirable patience in dealing with unreasonable parents, and a firm determination to uphold a high standard of integrity and truth, as well as of scholarship. Amongst schoolboy vices then prevalent, but now, we would fain hope, quite exploded, we meet with the mention of duck-stealing. The boys used to fish for ducks with baited hook and line from behind any farmyard wall, and one farmer's wife was nearly driven out of her mind by seeing a duck waddle hurriedly across the yard and then walk up a perpendicular wall—not suspecting that there was a hook in the duck's mouth and a boy behind the wall pulling at it. One frequent and possibly well-founded cause of discontent arose from the coarse fare then too commonly provided at public schools, and which stands out in unpleasant contrast with the epicurean touches and allusions to trout and salmon, grouse and dotterel, 'punch aux quatre fleuves,' which abound in the correspondence, and for which the purple dinners of the epoch were notorious. The last marked act of insubordination before Butler resigned the mastership was the so-called 'beef row,' when the boys one and all left the dining hall, declaring the meat was not fit to eat, and as the prepositors refused to apologize they were all dismissed. Some of the most brilliant of Butler's scholars—Robert Scott (Dean of Rochester) and Dr. Bateson (Master of St. John's) amongst

them
made t
Wi
Shrews
success
Univer
the Po
prose—
monote
names—
honour
days of
of the
Benjam
bridge
the Bro
was sur
not yet
scholar
rence of
fied its
except
We
gratified
which t
letter ad
bridge,
said by
for 'per
example
' *For*
by hap.
sit and th
is not ve
the two v
forsitan
opinions.
nitedula
sacra," h
relating a
matter o
aliquæ st
because l
a probab
used with
always h

them—were leaders in this outbreak. Of course their parents made them apologize, and peace was restored.

With such occasional rufflings of its surface the current of Shrewsbury school life flowed on with uniform and unexampled success. All the most distinguished classical prizes at both Universities—the Ireland, the Craven, the Bell scholarships, the Porson and other medals for Greek and Latin verse and prose—were carried off by men from Shrewsbury with monotonous iteration. It would fill pages to record the mere names—reproduced in an Appendix from the Shrewsbury honour boards—of those who won high distinction in the days of Dr. Butler and his illustrious successor. The fame of the school might well have culminated in 1823, when Benjamin Hall Kennedy gained the Porson prize at Cambridge while yet a boy in the sixth form, and was adjudged the Browne medal for a Latin ode; but even this distinction was surpassed in 1831, when Thomas Brancker, admitted, but not yet resident, at Wadham, was elected Ireland University scholar before he had left school. To obviate the recurrence of such precocious successes each University so modified its statutes as to exclude from the competitions all except their own resident members.

We look with an interest which is not destined to be gratified for some illustrations of the manner of teaching which turned out all the ripest scholars of its day, but a letter addressed to his son, then an undergraduate at Cambridge, and occasioned by an exaggerated report of something said by Professor Scholefield about Dr. Butler's use of *forte* for 'perhaps,' is too striking, as well as being the only extant example of his lucidity of exposition, to be passed over.

'*Forte* is the ablative case of *fors*; and signifies by chance or by *hap*. *Forsitan* is the nominative case of *fors*, joined to the verb *sit* and the conjunction *an*, and answers to the word *perhaps*, which is not very different from *by-haps*. But the difference in the use of the two words is this: *forte* is used to express accident or chance; *forsitan* to express doubt. *Forte* relates to facts. *Forsitan* to opinions. Thus when Horace says, "*Forte per angustam tenuis nitedula rimam Repserat in cumeram frumenti*," or, "*Ibam forte via sacra*," he could not have said *forsitan* in either case, for he was relating an accidental matter of fact, not a probable, but doubtful, matter of opinion. When Virgil says "*forsitan illum Deducant aliquæ stabula in Gortynia vaccæ*," he could not have said "*forte*," because he was not relating an actual matter of fact, but hazarding a probable conjecture. Furthermore you will generally find *forte* used with a past tense, *forsitan* with a present. This does not always hold, but from the nature of their significations it must gene-

rally. Furthermore *forte* is generally used with an indicative; *forsitan* is used with a subjunctive only, or an indicative future which is equivalent to a subjunctive present. A subjunctive after *forte* often depends upon a preceding conjunction—as “cum forte venissem.” But though this is the broad distinction between *forte* and *forsitan*, yet is *forte* sometimes used instead of *forsitan*, though the converse may not hold good. When Cicero says, “Nisi forte magis erit parricida,” a doubt and not a matter of fact is being expressed; but then you see *nisi* is being joined with *forte*, which brings it tantamount to *forsitan*, and in similar cases *forte* is used with these sort of conjunctions—“Si quis vestrum forte miretur,” for “Forsitan aliquis miretur.” In “forte aliquis dixerit,” doubt is expressed as much as if the writer had said “forsitan aliquis dixerit”—but there is a question in this case whether *forsitan* should not be used instead of *forte*.

‘Now I presume you know as much about *forte* and *forsitan* as the Greek professor, and perhaps a little more’ (i. 325, 326).

It might have been supposed that the alumni of the foremost school in England for classical attainments would have met with the most cordial welcome at any college of either University, but this conclusion is not supported by Butler’s correspondence. In some instances unworthy jealousy of such unbroken success, in others possibly a suspicion of Butler’s influence and leaning in favour of reform, in others again, a hardly concealed preference for men of aristocratic connexion over mere scholars, led to strong and outspoken remonstrance. Accusations of unfairness and favouritism, reports of serious disagreement among the examiners, and a lack of that high sense of scrupulous honour which in later years has stamped University transactions with the strictest impartiality, meet us in these pages. One correspondent writes, March 1824, ‘I hear there was nothing but *fracas* among the examiners the whole week, owing to that brute Scholefield, who has succeeded in making the examination give entire dissatisfaction to all parties’ (i. 262). This opinion is confirmed by the Rev. S. Tillbrook, a fellow of Peterhouse and one of Butler’s most genial correspondents. He mentions that Homer, Plato, Euripides, Sophocles, Herodotus, Lucian, Theocritus, Lucretius, Virgil, Horace, Ovid, Cicero (with the exception of, perhaps, a letter to Atticus), Tacitus, Livy, Terence, Juvenal, were altogether omitted, and adds, ‘The examiners ought all of them to have been well flogged.’ The same correspondent writes, three years later, ‘Gordon has been unfairly used, I think. Had I been here he should not have tried for the Smith’s prize. Two of three examiners Trinity men, so that it can only be considered a college prize

now.
alone
Turner
examin
sitting
nation
Dr. W
passed
Cambr
that th
was, no
their re

No
Univer
awaken
off the
1833,
examin
reporte
this sp
their s
special
training
not the
long le
in the
he exp

‘In
If the q
selves,
taught
for it i
taught
general
reach o
Shrews
more th
with re
college
hands o
their ov

Dr.
of bei
Oxford
quence

now. Besides, Airey was private tutor to Turner—a fact alone sufficient to turn the scale directly or indirectly in Turner's favour. Now the Master of Trinity, *ex officio*, is an examiner for the Craven scholarship, but, as his two sons are sitting now, he very becomingly withdraws from the examination' (i. 327). Of course the procedure then adopted by Dr. Wordsworth is now the invariable rule. Several letters passed between Dr. Butler and the authorities at Magdalen, Cambridge. There was a general persuasion at Shrewsbury that their candidates were not regarded favourably, and there was, not unnaturally, reluctance amongst the boys to take up their residence there.

Nor was the dissatisfaction confined to Dr. Butler's own University. At Oxford some jealousy was apparently awakened by the circumstance that Shrewsbury men carried off the Ireland six times in the seven years from 1826 to 1833, and it was even proposed to alter the style of the examination to put an end to such a monopoly. It was reported to Butler that he was believed to cram his boys with this special end in view, and it was more than hinted that their success was due to a lucky knack of hitting off the special subjects of the examination rather than to their training in sound and thorough scholarship. Dr. Butler was not the man to sit idly under such misrepresentation, and in a long letter to the Rev. G. Booth—a gentleman of whose status in the matter we are left by the editor in absolute darkness—he exposed the absurdity of the charge.

'In such a case,' he writes, 'there can be no unfair monopoly. If the questions proposed by the examiners (which rest with themselves, and must be unknown to me) are within the compass of well-taught boys, they must be within the compass of all the candidates, for it is not to be supposed that those who have not been well taught would be competent to offer themselves. If the questions are generally asked in college lecture-rooms, they are clearly within the reach of all the candidates. I cannot therefore understand how the Shrewsbury boys could have any unfair monopoly in those questions more than in the light and air, which are equally open to all; and with regard to boys just admitted, questions usually proposed in college lecture-rooms rather tend to throw the monopoly into the hands of their opponents, who have been longer at college, than into their own' (ii. 50).

Dr. Butler's biographer claims for him the unique honour of being the only schoolmaster who has compelled both Oxford and Cambridge to change their regulations in consequence of the defeat of their undergraduates by his as yet

non-resident pupils. How he compassed such signal successes was doubtless owing to a variety of causes. He was *felix opportunitate successionis* at a date when men were awakening to the need of improved teaching and discipline in our public schools. He knew how to inspire his boys with a taste for the beauty of classic literature and composition, and to kindle in them the spirit of emulation, which was sustained by a system of examinations then almost unknown. His early University successes naturally attracted boys of promise to Shrewsbury, and made it pre-eminent for that finished scholarship which was its most marked characteristic. How close and laborious and persistent was his interest at once in the wide field of Greek and Latin scholarship, and in the individual care of each lad under his charge, is abundantly proved by his voluminous correspondence, and it is astonishing that, amidst the engrossing demands upon his time, he should have found leisure for the copious letters here given us to Baron Merian, the Rev. J. Tate, and other leading scholars: letters filled with remote digressions into the bye-paths of scholarship, where but few readers will follow him in our own hurried days. A wider interest attaches to the following account of work at Shrewsbury from the pen of one of its most brilliant scholars, Dr. B. H. Kennedy:

'Homer was always one lesson a week. Some Greek play was always in hand. Demosthenes was a favourite author of his, and we did some Thucydides, but not a great deal, and no Plato that I remember. In Latin Cicero, Virgil, and Horace were his favourite books, always to the fore. History and geography were never neglected. He had the upper fifth along with the sixth to most lessons. He was of course an excellent scholar and no ordinary teacher, but his crowning merit was the establishment of an emulative system, in which talent and industry always gained their just recognition and reward in good examinations. This it was that made his school so successful and so great. Added to this he always advised and recommended private reading, and to obedience to this oft-repeated recommendation it was that I owed my scholarship and my success at Cambridge, for I had read a great deal privately before I went to college—all Thucydides, all Tacitus, all Sophocles and Æschylus, much Aristophanes, Pindar, Herodotus, Demosthenes, and Plato, besides Cicero' (i. 252-3).

In 1821 Dr. Butler was appointed by Lord Cornwallis, then Bishop of Lichfield and Coventry, to the Archdeaconry of Derby, and he entered with characteristic energy upon the duties of his new office. It was only during the school holidays that he had leisure to visit the parishes under his charge, but he made the most of his opportunities, and at his

visitation
hundred
summer
into the
was th
cluded

'Of
residen
indeed,
of acco
So that
residen
there ar
ten case
incumb
in the p
residing
which h
and the
being th
small p
curate o
5 of the
residen
is perfor

In
in Chu
parishe
whatev
Dilapid
glebe-h
will rec
Life A
surance
still bu

In
the edu
us it is
most c
questio
viewed
indulge
decline
other sh
of som
abunda

visitation in 1825 he stated that he had travelled about twelve hundred miles with this object in the course of the last two summers. A paragraph from his charge affords us insight into the condition of the Church in the county of Derby, which was then commensurate with the archdeaconry, and which included 163 parishes, besides thirty donatives or peculiars.

'Of these 163 churches,' he stated, '91 have houses fit for the residence of a clergyman; 20 have houses, but unfit for residence—indeed, nearly all these last-mentioned are mere cottages, just capable of accommodating a labourer and his family; and 52 have no house. So that in fact there are 72 churches which virtually have no place of residence for their minister. On the 91 livings which have houses, there are resident 60 incumbents and 21 curates. In the remaining ten cases, in which neither incumbent nor curate appear resident, the incumbent, generally, is so virtually: either living in his own house in the parish instead of the parsonage, and himself doing the duty, or residing on an adjoining living, and doing also the duty of that on which he does not reside. Of the 20 livings which have no fit houses, and the 52 which have no house at all, many are of small value; and being themselves insufficient for the support of a clergyman, and of small population, requiring only one single duty, are served by the curate or incumbent of a neighbouring parish. There are, however, 5 of these which have their incumbent, and 5 which have their curate resident in the parish, and of the remaining 62 the duty, in 39 cases, is performed by the incumbent himself' (i. 284).

In the same charge the number of children being educated in Church schools is given as 11,759, whilst twenty-nine parishes, with 14,000 inhabitants, were without any school whatever. Those who are aggrieved by the pressure of the Dilapidations Act will learn how ruinous the condition of glebe-houses often was seventy years ago, whilst all readers will recognize in the then recent foundation of University Life Assurance societies a valuable stimulus to early life insurance which Dr. Butler earnestly commended, and which is still but too imperfectly adopted.

In the next year Archdeacon Butler dealt specially with the education question, and from the meagre extracts given us it is evident that he did not approve of more than the most elementary instruction for the peasantry. On such questions his opinions were those prevalent in his day. He viewed with deep concern the spread of wealth, luxury, and indulgence, which he regarded as the precursors of national decline. Nor did he esteem highly handbooks to science, and other short cuts to knowledge, then budding under the auspices of some philanthropic societies, and in our time so superabundant:—

'Nothing,' he said, 'appears less likely to promote great discoveries in science, and bring forth men of lofty and commanding genius, who stamp their names on the age in which they live, than multiplying these helps to learning. Mighty difficulties make mighty minds; it is the struggle with obstacles apparently insurmountable that strengthens the intellect, that throws it upon its own resources—baffled, it is true, in many a conflict, but still rising with fresh vigour from every fall. But when the road is smooth and easy, when resources are everywhere at hand, and even when the spur of ambition is blunted by the facility of attainment, it is in vain to expect great and towering minds' (i. 312, 313).

We have only space for reference to one more of Archdeacon Butler's charges, which elicited a remonstrance from some of the Evangelical clergy, who thought they were covertly aimed at in the following sentence:—

'Whoever looks with any degree of reflection into the page of history will see that its various epochs are not more clearly marked by the reigns of princes and the lapse of centuries, than by certain modes of thinking and acting, produced by the influence of circumstance, habit, design, caprice, and, above all, example, upon mankind. Thus one age shall be characterized by its barbarism, another by its chivalric spirit, another by its superstition, another by its piety, another by its irreligion, another by its literature, another by its zeal for innovation. If I were asked what is the characteristic of the present age, I should say a morbid sentimentality, not to give it any coarser name, than which, I fear, there cannot be a stronger mark of a declining moral tact' (i. 357, 358).

These words, standing alone, would hardly account for any Evangelical remonstrance, but the editor informs us that the rest of the charge is marked by a not less evident dislike of what he terms the aggressive self-consciousness and bigotry of the still dominant Evangelical party. If this were so, we can hardly wonder that it should have called forth a temperately expressed protest from one of the clergy of the archdeaconry. We quote a portion of Dr. Butler's reply as indicating his own theological position very clearly.

'If I have used such expressions as justify lukewarmness or indifference in the cause of religion, I have greatly misrepresented my own feelings and conviction. But I am not aware that warmth of colouring is necessary to the language or cause of truth. I believe that many sincere and pious Christians suffer themselves to be led too strongly by their feelings—I mean so as to think that all those are lukewarm in the cause of Christianity or wavering in their faith, and deficient in "earnestness and spirituality of mind" (if I may borrow your own expression), who cannot believe that the essence of piety or the proof of inspiration consists in giving way to their

1897
emotion
truly pi
yet sob
ever be
was bro
reflecti
me in i

Th
falls in
rally s
We ha
of Diss
Arnold
an auth
ing an
scheme
small li
promot
upon th
us. A
excessi
Dr. Bu
day un
well-de
admiri
biograp
réchauf
vapid
great a
preach
belaud
of Suss
Duke's
perman

The
telling
corresp
at the
it. No
history
country
a wider
elicited
Butler
United

emotions. Now when they think this, they are unjust to many truly pious and good men and sincere Christians, whose feelings are yet sobered down by their judgment, who believe that zeal should ever be tempered by discretion. . . . This is my belief. In this I was brought up ; it is confirmed to me by reading, observation, and reflection, and every day's observation of passing events strengthens me in it' (i. 359, 360).

The second volume of Butler's life and correspondence falls immensely behind the first in interest, and contains literally scores of letters that might well have been spared us. We have had full accounts of the struggle for the admission of Dissenters to the Universities in the graphic biographies of Arnold and Sedgwick ; and particulars, even from so competent an authority, of the advantages of clothing clubs, of the irritating annoyance caused by refractory choirmen and singers, of schemes, now long superseded, for increasing the incomes of small livings, and of applications, more or less successful, for the promotion of poor and obscure priests, can scarcely fail to pall upon the reader if presented in such bulk as lies here before us. A similar lack of due sense of proportion appears in the excessive space allotted to the circumstances attending Dr. Butler's resignation of his headmastership, the last speech-day under his rule at Shrewsbury, and the inevitable and well-deserved testimonials presented by grateful pupils and admiring friends. It is strange that so really competent a biographer should not have realized that of all the tasteless *réchauffés* that can be served up nothing is more stale and vapid than such ephemeral details, which tend to reduce a great and successful scholar's career to the level of a local preacher, whose ministry, on his dismissal, is conventionally belauded and teapotted. Even the royal visits of the Duke of Sussex and the Princess Victoria to Shrewsbury, and the Duke's correspondence with Dr. Butler, present nothing of permanent importance.

The same 'lack of distinction,' to use Matthew Arnold's telling phrase, pervades the greater part of the remaining correspondence, from which a dozen letters from Dr. Hook, at the outset of the Oxford movement, are unable to redeem it. No new light is cast upon that critical period whose history is now so fully portrayed, and the high-souled, eager country vicar displays the same characteristics which found a wider field of exercise at Leeds, but which, at this period, elicited some good-humoured, yet sensible, banter from Butler over Hook's Quixotic idea of emigrating to the United States, and his premature anxiety lest Archbishop

Whately should Sabellianize the standards of the Anglican Communion. If we quote one sentence it is because it contains a statement of the writer's method of upholding the divinity of our Blessed Lord, to which men of less intellectual power might well restrict themselves.

'I do not suppose,' he writes, 'that Archbishop Whately or Mr. Cox can make any alterations in the Liturgy *de suo*; whatever is done in that way must, I suppose, either be done by a special commission directed to certain Bishops and Clergy to prepare and report, or by a convocation summoned for that purpose. I think we need not anticipate troubles. Of Archbishop Whately's religious opinions I have no means of judging, never having read any of his works. I suppose from your term of Sabellian that he makes some distinction between Person and Essence; but I am content to believe in the divinity of Christ, because I find it in Scripture, and I hold those who attempt to explain the doctrine to be anything but wise. I am content to say, not "*Credo quia impossibile est*," but "*Credo quia revelatum est*," and, without attempting to understand the Divine mystery, to pursue the duties resulting from it' (ii. p. 76).

Some incidental allusions in the very miscellaneous correspondence of the second volume are amusing and occasionally instructive. Butler bewailed the wide unpopularity of the Church, and the danger he feared would result from it, and was anxious to press reforms, some of which are still urgently needed. His ideas of clerical submission to authority were strongly autocratic; and he questioned the lawfulness of much that the clergy now allow themselves without scruple, even disapproving of their forming voluntary associations to discuss matters of interest to themselves. With better reason he strongly deprecated the purchase of popular town livings by trustees, in order to stereotype a certain school of doctrine, and the transference to such livings of Church endowments originally bestowed on much broader conditions. The recent scandal at Clifton is a case in point. We may rejoice that bishops are no longer 'at a discount,' to use Mr. Tillbrook's expressive allusion to the Bristol riots, and that such gross examples of evil living amongst the clergy as we here read of are at length brought under their effectual control. But we cannot repress the exclamation, 'Save me from my friends!' as we read the following account of the Bench, with the self-revelation which the other sentences we quote contain. Our author says that Dr. Butler was not deterred from speaking out by any unworthy fear that he should 'give himself away'; and we trace the hereditary *insouciance* in this reproduction of a splenetic epistle to Bishop Maltby (that

had b
It is d

'L
you fin
Can yo
superla
or fam
private
could t
commo
I will
have b
me son
very in
by thir
health
Keate
and his
with it,
and m
without

Al
accum
writes
his bo
Tw
quence
the pu
the bis
the his
field an
dinaria
and a
He wa
able b
straggl
to his

had better have lain buried) after the lapse of sixty years. It is dated October 9, 1834 :

'Look at the Bench—with the rare exception of yourself can you find a man on it who owes his preferment to his actual merit? Can you name one other, not even excepting the Bishop of London, superlative as his merits are, who does not owe it to private tuition or family connexion? Look at one, the utmost amount of whose private tuition consisted in teaching writing—but then that was all he could teach—to a late Premier, and who has not undergone even the common course of academic education; yet this man is a bishop. . . . I will not pretend to say that I am not disappointed, but I should have been less so had the disappointment been softened by giving me something else *ad interim*. I confess to you what it would be very injurious to me to confess to the public, that I feel worn out by thirty-six years' very laborious occupation, and I see Mrs. Butler's health and activity impaired by it. I see Carey with his bishopric, Keate with his canonry of Windsor, Russell with his great living and his stall at Canterbury, Tate with his canonry (God bless him with it, dear, honest fellow!) I see Goodenough with his deanery, and my namesake of Harrow with his living; but I see myself without any of these good things' (ii. 95-6).

Alas for poor human nature! The writer had already accumulated sufficient fortune to allow of his accepting (so writes Maltby) one of the more poorly endowed sees, and his books and antiquities were sold after his death for 10,000*l*.

Two years more of wearisome school labour, with its consequences—which it would have been injurious to confess to the public—and the remnant of a worn-out life was given to the bishopric of the Black Country at a critical moment in the history of Church and State. That as Bishop of Lichfield and Coventry Dr. Butler did all, and more than a valetudinarian could be expected to have done, during the two years and a half that remained to him we are not disposed to deny. He was a good scholar, a great schoolmaster, and a respectable bishop, well worthy of a more finished shrine than the straggling and irregular pile which his grandson has erected to his memory.

ART. VI.—THE DEVELOPMENT OF RELIGION.

1. *History of Intellectual Development: on the lines of Modern Evolution.* By JOHN BEATTIE CROZIER. Vol. I. (London, New York, and Bombay, 1897.)
2. *Ancient Ideals. A Study of Intellectual and Spiritual Growth from Early Times to the Establishment of Christianity.* By HENRY OSBORN TAYLOR. (New York and London, 1896.)

THE title of the first-named work is perplexing. We must doubtless understand that 'Modern Evolution' means the modern doctrine upon that subject; but we had hardly supposed that one doctrine of Evolution had established itself in sole possession of the name. However, we shall not spend time upon the title: the subject which Mr. Crozier undertakes is to us extremely interesting, if, indeed, we rightly understand it. It is thus described by himself:

'Here, again' (viz. in Mr. Herbert Spencer), 'as in the case of Hegel and Comte, the law which he has propounded, the great law of Evolution, is, as we have said, much too wide and comprehensive to be of scientific value in the special problems of intellectual development with which it is the object of this volume to deal. . . . The only section of intellectual development which in this sense Mr. Spencer has treated scientifically is the development from dreams &c. of man's primitive religious conceptions of God, the soul and a Future Life, as seen in those savage races who are the existing representatives of the thought and feeling of prehistoric man. But he has stopped just at the point where they become of interest to us, viz. when these primitive conceptions are taken up into the thought of civilized nations, of Hindoos, Greeks, and Europeans, and woven by them into religions and philosophies. Into this Mr. Spencer nowhere enters, and so he has left the field of investigation of the Evolution of these higher and more interesting stages of Intellectual Development, still open.'

In the attempt to fill up this gap the author had not gone far before he

'discovered that after all ordinary scientific causes had done their best or worst, in the explanation of the phenomena under discussion, there still remained a residuum which was unexplained by all special explanations: some unknown Power as it were which held all the factors together and constrained them all to a definite and apparently predetermined end. This Power, whose nature was left quite undetermined, did not make itself plainly apparent in the evolution of the purely philosophical systems. . . . But in religions, on

the oth
not st
nature
our inc
nating
remain
certain
dency a
tions a

TH
his tre
exists
sideral

'althou
stupen
and per
to all th
emphas
prevail
contrar
to the c

We sh
that in
began
been so
which
should
attribu
course
stood r

Ho
as just
it aims
is true
is scien
that it
history
us some
tion wh
ment of
science,

In t
a loss f
and the
masters

the other hand, like those of Judaism and Christianity, which deal not so much with the purely logical intelligence as with the entire nature of man, and therefore with his conscious will, the progress of our inquiry not only disclosed the presence of the Unknown Coordinating Power of which I have spoken, whose nature had so far remained undeterminate, but this power began to clothe itself with certain definite attributes. It exhibited, for example, a steady tendency to the production of higher and higher moral and social relations among men' (pp. 11-13).

This is the author's subject. And we are to presuppose in his treatment of it the assurance that an unknown Power exists which steadily works for righteousness. We are considerably surprised, therefore, to read the statement that

'although the course of this History thus supports the belief in a stupendous and overreaching Supernaturalism everywhere enfolding and pervading the world and its affairs, and giving scope and exercise to all that is properly religious in thought and feeling, it nowhere lays emphasis on any particular one of those supernaturalisms which have prevailed among the different nations and peoples; . . . on the contrary, it treats them one and all as means and instruments merely to the one great end of Morality' (p. 15).

We should have thought that when it had been discovered that in the Jewish and Christian religions the unknown Power began to clothe itself with attributes, a plain distinction had been set between those faiths and other supernaturalisms in which the Power appears without any attributes at all. We should have imagined that a Power which clothes itself with attributes and pursues a steady, definite, and determined course of moral guidance, thereby ceased to be unknown and stood revealed.

However, even with restrictions which we cannot regard as justified, we enter upon the work with much interest. For it aims at rendering an account of Evolution in active life. It is true that what it professes to give us is still science. But it is science in its operation upon real life; and we may hope that it will come into such close connexion with the actual history of the periods and peoples of whom it treats as to show us something of the real work of this mighty factor Evolution which is supposed to rule us all. If Mr. Crozier's treatment of the great periods which he passes in review be true to science, we suppose it ought also to be true to history.

In that hope we enter on its perusal; for we are much at a loss for a reconciliation of the science of human evolution and the living facts of human history. We find in those great masters of Evolutionary science whom Mr. Crozier names, a

programme of human progress founded upon the same principles of development which have obtained in the formation of the solar systems and the subsequent processes of physical change. In the application of these principles to human history there is no more room for variation than there was in the domain of inanimate nature. We grant that it is idle to deny that there is much in history to support such a view. There is a progress and a development, a growth in each generation, and a transmission of inheritance from one generation to another, sufficient to give the evolutionist plausible reason to presume on the completeness of his method; for his method is not supposed to bring him to close quarters with human history.

But when the historian takes up the tale and views the life of a generation, and, still more, the life of an individual, as it is lived, it is impossible to trace the operation of the scientific law which seemed so plain when the scientific man held the field. A number of words and phrases come into use for which there was no room in science. Free will, motive, choice, sin and righteousness, reward and punishment, love and hatred, and a host of terms which belong to the same class with these, are the indispensable instruments in the historian's work. And when he has done it, it possesses as high a claim to be called true as the scientific treatise from which such anthropomorphic terms are rigidly excluded. Not only so; but when science does descend to treat in its style any subject in which human will has a place, its picture of things is apt to be very untrue to life; so that we admire the prudence of those great teachers who keep the statement of principles and their general operation carefully apart from practical application to the realities of history.

Now, the Bible is not a book of science. Various attempts have been made both by friends and foes to compel it to assume that position. The reaction against the claims of the pre-Reformation Church led the Reformation in some extreme regions of its influence to find in the Bible a universal oracle of truth such as the Middle Ages found in the Church: Calvinism wrested it to the support of a system which was scientific in its own way and as tyrannical in the suppression of free will as the physical theories of our own time. But these were great wrongs to the Bible. It is not a book of science, but a book of life. It does not, as Archbishop Whately was wont to remark, observe that invariable precision in the use of terms which is characteristic of science. It occupies itself with human life. A large part of its matter

consist
centra
races
those
the th
Whate
of the
science
purify
within
verted,
its app
which
Theref
express
It is a
indeed
and the
present
man w
itself.
attempt
gress o
space t
of his v

He
ception
world i
moves
as differ
bees, th
scious a
the pro
the Wo
and con
arrange
ends far
underst
the pro
human
indirect
Ancient

'At
with a n
it, they s
VOL.

consists of biography, and the Gospels which form its central part are included in this description; its history of races and nations is of a biographical character, and even those portions which are of a more didactic form glow with the thoughts of living men and the doings of their time. Whatever power the Bible has had over the moral progress of the world contrasts with that which has been exercised by science and scientific books. It sets itself to enlighten and purify and encourage the living powers of man which lie within his human consciousness, dormant possibly or perverted, but common to the race. By the unequalled force of its appeal to the living powers, Christianity and the Bible which speaks for it have done their work among mankind. Therefore it is a most difficult enterprise for any philosopher to express the living activity of Christianity in terms of science. It is a species of vivisection which requires a skilled operator indeed: for the life escapes in the very attempt to dissect it, and the scientific treatise in which the results are summed up presents not the slightest appeal to any of the faculties of man which have been so powerfully affected by the religion itself. We turn, then, at once to examine Mr. Crozier's attempt to frame a scientific statement of the rise and progress of Christianity. It is fairer to him to devote our limited space to a careful consideration of the most important part of his work than to a vague synopsis of the whole.

He lays, to begin with, great stress upon a clear perception of the respective methods of the ancient and the modern world in the promotion of good. The Genius of the World moves to the steady end of a perfected civilization; but just as different means are used for the fertilization of plants, the bees, the wind, the birds, each in turn, becoming the unconscious agent of the process, so it is in the greater matters of the progress of mankind. Some have become the agents of the World Spirit without knowing what they did. Their wars and conquests, their ambitions and self-interests have by the arrangement of the Presiding Genius of the world subserved ends far more sublime than those they knew. But others have understood the objects and knowingly pursued them. Thus, the promotion of civilization is favoured by many kinds of human action, but all are reducible to two, the direct and the indirect; the last-named of which was the method of the Ancients and the first-named of the Moderns.

'At the present day when good men and women become fired with a noble enthusiasm to leave the world better than they found it, they set to work to accomplish their object by the direct propa-

ganda [? propagation] of the reforms they wish to see established ; advocating them and urging their acceptance on men, not because they are prescribed by any religious code, but for their power to lead naturally and inevitably to the higher life they have in view. Hence we find them proclaiming abroad, without further recommendation than the good results on civilization and morality which they believe must flow from them, such reforms as the abolition of slavery, the extension of the suffrage, socialism, the closing of public houses, the eight hours day, and the living wage' (p. 251).

Our experience of the modern method is not the same as that of Mr. Crozier. According to our observation, good men and women when they set about propagating their reforms are apt to use among the readiest and most effective arguments which occur to them the prescription of such reforms by the code of Christ or their close connexion with what He has taught. And if in many cases the religious argument is omitted it is because it is presumed that a desire to please Him exists among His professed followers. The ancient method, according to Mr. Crozier, depended upon the fact that then morality was as intimately bound up with religion as a child with its mother, and those who wished to improve morality could only do so by the indirect process of striking at religion. It would seem to us that both in ancient and modern times religion and morality have been natural companions ; bad religion has been a fertile source of bad morality, and where such a state of things exists the best thing to be done in modern times, quite as much as in ancient, is to overthrow the bad religion and give to morality the help of a good one.

Mr. Crozier pays the Christian religion the compliment of saying that the modern practice of advocating reforms on the ground of their natural tendency alone is due, not merely to the prevalence of the scientific spirit, but to 'the spirit of the Religion of Jesus as distinguished from the dogmas of the Christian Church' (p. 258). But the spirit of the Religion of Jesus as we find it displayed in the Sermon on the Mount is a spirit which values acts and results in their connexion with Him. He represents perfect humanity, and the beliefs and acts which He prescribes to man are such as men can perceive to be true and good. But the approval of the Lord adds an infinite recommendation to them. Nor can it ever be a perfection in the modern spirit to separate His commandments from Him and value the morality which He preached while forgetting Him. We cannot, therefore, regard this very futile distinction between the ancient and modern methods as

a hope
task v
rise fi
natura
to us
the sup
its pre
both i
our au
of His
clusion
superm

'It
a relig
letter,
allowed
inner e
tempera

But it
were th
Lord fo
and po
link ev
basis of

And
account
the free
Testam
greatest
world a
but not
nation a
the Ma
observa
of these
the inw
in the b
from ch
Father,
name of

The
is quite
was ide
near at
sider tha

a hopeful equipment with which to set out upon the arduous task which Mr. Crozier proposes to himself of tracing the rise first of Christ Himself and then of Christianity by natural evolution out of preceding elements: or, what seems to us more difficult still, by a supernatural evolution in which the supernatural is always indiscernible, no special signs of its presence being perceptible. We confess ourselves to be both interested and provoked by the able statement which our author makes of the work of our Saviour upon the minds of His followers, at the same time refusing to draw the conclusion from it which anybody who, like him, believes in a supernatural influence in the world ought in reason to deduce.

'It was the first time,' he says, 'that in the history of the world a religion had appeared which liberated men from the bondage of the letter, to fixed and inelastic external acts and observances, and allowed them to freely find their way to the moral ideal through an inner experience based on individual peculiarities of character, temperament or genius' (p. 261).

But it is a great mistake to say that individual peculiarities were the basis of the method by which the disciples of the Lord found their way to the moral ideal. It was the person and power of Christ Himself, so human and so divine as to link every personal peculiarity with Him, that formed the basis of their new life.

And the same obvious defect is found in the clever account which the same page contains of the examples of the freedom of the new religion which are found in the New Testament characters. Some, like Jesus Himself, found the greatest help and stimulus in cheerful intercourse with the world and their fellow men; others, like St. Paul, in a mild but not excessive asceticism; others, like St. John, in imagination and meditation, and in hanging on the discourses of the Master; others, like St. James, in a more scrupulous observance of the law. Such may be the external peculiarities of these individual lives; but they are here named without the inward source of power which united and identified them in the body of Christ and filled them with a spirit not derived from cheerful intercourse with their fellows but from the Father, whom Mr. Crozier persists in disguising under the name of the World Spirit.

The morality of Christ was, indeed, an ideal one. But it is quite unreasonable to say that the cause why His morality was ideal is found in the belief that the kingdom of God was near at hand. That is to say, we are actually asked to consider that the Lord and His Apostles, having in their minds

and moral natures such notions of holiness as those which we find in their words and writings, would have suppressed them because of the impossibility of getting the world to live up to them, if they had not supposed that this imperfect world was soon coming to an end and a new society to be established, in which their lofty plan of life would find a possible acceptance and practice. Reformers of the stamp of the early Christians, not to name their Master, produce the best morality that they can—they never hide it because the next generation is unlikely to practise it. And, moreover, whatever truth we may allow to the assertion that an early appearance of the kingdom of God was expected, we cannot with any fairness attribute such prominence to it as is here claimed. There are far more constant signs in the Lord's conversations and in the Apostles' teachings of a system designed for permanent existence in a world constituted as ours than of an expectation that the scene of the work of the religion was to be speedily changed. Were it otherwise, it would be a great anomaly that teaching which owed its enthusiasm to the hope of an approaching end of the world that now is, should be better adapted for moral work when such expectations have become lifeless than anything that has been offered by those who thought of the existing system of human things as stretching indefinitely forward as well as indefinitely back.

Mr. Crozier quite recognizes this extraordinary adaptation of Christianity for affecting the world in permanence, 'Christianity,' he says, 'by the very logic of its ideal aim, which was always being approached but never reached, was pledged to open before men an infinite horizon, and to give free and untrammelled range and expansion to the human spirit.' Extremely true; but how are plain people to assure themselves that this was not the very thing that was intended by the framers of the system? Mr. Crozier not only refuses to credit the earthly founders of Christianity with having perceived the tendencies of their own system. Its capabilities came by surprise, according to him, even upon the Genius of the World. We suppose our readers would hardly believe that such a sentence as that we are about to quote had been indited by an author of much intelligence if we did not give it to them in his own words.

'And so it came to pass that a doctrine which was originally devised for another purpose, which was intended only for a comparatively few individuals and for a very limited period of time, was seized on by the Genius of the World as the very variation it wanted

for its
former
men a
It app
as cap
of tea
that v
existe
the A
One v
World
recogn
of per
of the
of a c
moral
fully b
and w
divine
He wi
when
inspire
to Jes
Christ
missio
Ou
gony a
a sing
for the
would
was in
conceiv
furnish
Atoner
shadow
been d
quietly
build t
cosmog
sin and
cosmog
Mosaic
comme
great m
and not

for its own work, and became, when expanded, modified, and transformed to meet the wants of society as a whole, a doctrine for all men and all times' (p. 262).

It appears that we are to regard the Genius of the World as capable of expanding, modifying, and transforming a body of teaching which it has found lying about in its world, yet that we are forbidden to suppose that this teaching owes its existence to the Genius of the World itself. And this, although the Author of the system habitually claimed that it was due to One whom he does not indeed call by the name Genius of the World, but by that of Father. Some men have refused to recognize the act of God in the Christian revelation for want of perceiving the importance of Christianity in the moral life of the world, and some have made the same refusal for want of a certainty that there is a divine Ruler who has man's moral life under His care. But here we have a writer who fully believes in the transcendent importance of Christianity, and with an equal certainty accepts the truth that there is a divine Power which rules the progress of human goodness, yet He will not put that and that together. The Church is right when she offers her homage to the Genius of the world who inspires her holiness, and right when she traces her holiness to Jesus Christ, but wrong when she finds the work of Jesus Christ to be as He Himself believed it—the execution of a mission from above.

Our author allows that the adoption of the Mosaic cosmogony and the binding of it with the rest of the Scriptures as a single divine revelation was an absolutely necessary step for the primitive Church in order to prevent divisions which would have been fatal to its unity and even its existence. It was inevitable; but that does not imply its truth. The author conceives that this 'necessary error' had the ill effect of furnishing St. Paul with the foundation for his theory of the Atonement, a 'harsh and gloomy doctrine which overshadowed the Christian conscience for centuries,' but 'has been discarded by the best minds in the Church, and allowed quietly to drop into oblivion.' St. Paul, however, did not build the Atonement on the historical facts of the Mosaic cosmogony, but upon the actual and universal experiences of sin and death of which we are all conscious. The Mosaic cosmogony, in which title Mr. Crozier apparently includes the Mosaic account of the fall of man, gives an account of the commencement of sin: an account which it would be a great mistake to regard as out of date. But it is the disease and not the commencement of the disease that is the most

important fact both to St. Paul and to us. And we know not what perverted theory of the Atonement the author is thinking of when he calls it harsh and gloomy and supposes it to be discarded. Certainly neither the epithets nor the disuse are true of the Scriptural and Catholic doctrine that God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish but have everlasting life.

But we pass from these preliminaries to what we may truly call the central chapter of the book. It is entitled 'Jesus Christ.' There have been many Lives of our Saviour by disbelievers in the religion which He founded. But it may be safely asserted that any account of that wondrous career which refuses to recognize its supernatural elements must be built upon some definite and assured theory which pronounces the supernatural account to be impossible. If the supernatural be in any way within reach of man; if it be even a possibility; if it be not proved to be no *vera causa* in human affairs; the conception of the life which was entertained by Him who lived it, and by those who recorded it, certainly holds the field. In reading Strauss or Renan, the reader is dependent in every page upon the strength of the previous assumption that the miraculous account is impossible. Mr. Crozier's chapter is cramped in point of space, and possesses no room for details such as add an interest to the narrative of Renan or Strauss, however painful it be. But it is still more fatal to our acceptance of his version of the Great Life that we all along feel that his theory of the course of history does not warrant that absolute exclusion of the supernatural which he expects us to presume.

When the Lord is baptized, we are bid to think it probable that it had not yet occurred to Him that He was the Messiah. But when He heard John announcing, with the authority of a prophet, that the kingdom of heaven was at hand, and 'perhaps' that the Messiah was even now in their midst, 'it is probable' that He felt within Himself that if the Messiah was a man more endowed than others with the spirit, and if the kingdom of God as a God of love were coming, 'who so likely to inaugurate that kingdom as the man to whom the true nature of God had been revealed?' (p. 282). Then with the passages and texts of Scripture bearing on both types of Messiah, the conquering and the humble, filling His mind and heart, He retired to the wilderness to consider Himself. And at first it seemed to Him that if God intended Him for the rôle of a conquering Messiah He would command the stones

to be
remer
live b
of the
recoil
in wh

To
was c
functi
that v
that I
specia
prop
tingui
doctri
nize a
circum
Found
moral
advan
Hims
learnt
the Ba
He pr
world
was fr
more
convir
must

An
going
Him b
at this
course
that H
But al
boding
key to
His m
plexed
texts v
tenor
and if
concep
proph

to be made bread for Him. But no miracle being performed, He remembered the words of Deuteronomy, that man should not live by bread alone. And so of the other temptations : each of them a wish of His own mind, from which He afterwards recoils, the Scripture in each case furnishing the true thought in which His pious soul takes refuge.

To the Lord, as to the rabbis of His time, the Scripture was of supreme authority, especially upon the nature and functions of the Messiah. Accordingly, we are to suppose that when once it has been revealed to Him in general terms, that He bears that character, a search in the Scripture for special passages reveals to Him the special conduct which is proper for Him in critical junctures. Now Mr. Crozier distinguishes the moral progress of mankind from the theological doctrines of any supposed revelations, and declines to recognize any special action of the World Spirit in the supernatural circumstances which the faith of Christians discerns in their Founder's life, and yet he would seem to link the code of morality which Christ preached, and to which such large advance in human morality is due, with the belief that He Himself entertained in His mission from God. He had learnt that God was a God of love : He had heard from John the Baptist that the kingdom of God was at hand. Therefore He proclaimed a morality adapted 'to a kingdom of God, a world unhampered by earthly restrictions, where the heart was free to follow its own better nature (p. 292). But the more He pondered upon the Scriptures the more He became convinced that His mission was to all mankind, and that He must suffer and probably die for the cause' (p. 296).

And so He proclaimed to His apostles His intention of going to Jerusalem to fulfil the 'programme marked out for Him by the prophets.' Our author believes himself to discern at this point a great change in the tone of the Lord's intercourse with His disciples. It was in a 'joyous happy strain' that He had sent them forth on their evangelical mission. But all was altered, and His tone became one of gloom, foreboding and sorrow. The author believes that he possesses a key to the whole of the Lord's procedure in the latter part of His ministry. It lies in this : that 'He was more or less perplexed and distracted by the conflicting bearings of the various texts which He believed to refer to Himself.' The general tenor of them was that He should suffer and probably die ; and if so His second advent, though foreign to the Jewish conception of the Messiah, would be rendered certain by the prophecy in Daniel, which He now often quoted as referring

to Himself: the prophecy in which the Son of Man was to come on the clouds of heaven (p. 302).

We find it painful to make further extracts of this nature, but they might be extended quite through those sacred days during which the Lord steadfastly set His face to meet His death and even through His last hours, which myriads of Christians have studied for an example of courage and patience. Mr. Crozier finds there stormy gusts of violence and suspicion or conflicting and rapidly alternating fits of violence, pathos, exaltation, and despair. And this is science. This is the work of an author who professes to trace for us the progress of human morality under the impulse of the World Spirit. We can discover no sign of science in any part of the chapter. No untrained literary man ever gave looser rein to his fancy or substituted more lavishly conjecture for fact.

Now, the exclusion of the supernatural from human affairs upon which Mr. Herbert Spencer insists is not complete enough to justify a purely secular account of religion in the daily life even of ordinary Christians. That theory teaches that we are aware of the existence of something beyond the world and its events. Though we may call this something Unknowable, yet we have no right to confess its existence and then proceed to treat religious phenomena as if the Unknowable had nothing to do with them. To this inconsistency is due the failure of Mr. Spencer to follow up his ghost theory into the higher thoughts of mankind; for which our present author reproves him. In his own philosophy the Unknowable appears as the World Spirit which, however shrouded in mystery, is known to be engaged in a constant effort to raise the morality of the race. A philosopher who has thus brought down the Unknowable into known connexion with human moral progress is more liable than Mr. Spencer to the accusation of inconsistency in refusing to recognize the World Spirit at work, in proportion as the World Spirit is a more definite working Power than the Unknowable. The Gospels interpret the facts of the life of Christ upon the supposition that God is an active Power in the world. And what necessity impels a philosopher who recognizes the World Spirit as an active moral power to set aside that explanation as inadmissible and substitute one of a purely secular character?

Our author's conception of the special work done by Christianity is that it carried the Pagan world out of a state in which the relations of man to man were founded on the type of those of master and slave into one founded

on th
to m
reach
Fathe
Spirit
publis
by H
events
positi
discip
and th
tamen
Paulin
pleads
basis
Apost
pel es
gerati
found
the de
and re
belief
his Ge
Lord's
grace
reality
grace
and G
Script
which
was to
it was
God.
natura
of the
teache
was ta
and ur
But he
that w
sanctio
to othe
would
We
Crozier

on those of parent and child. And he lays it down that, to make this mighty change, mankind must first have reached the belief in One Supreme God, the common Father of all mankind (p. 325)—a better title than World Spirit, and quite as scientific. But the faith which the Lord published was almost wrecked by His death. It was saved by His resurrection and ascension. These supernatural events not only rescued the faith, but placed it in a stronger position than before; and with this faith in their hearts the disciples proceeded to carry their messages into the Jewish and the Pagan worlds. The simple reader of the New Testament does not find there the contrast between Jewish and Pauline Christianity which Mr. Crozier discovers. St. Paul pleads with Churches placed in the Gentile world upon the basis of the Hebrew Scriptures, and, on the other hand, the Apostles who were most attached to Judaism preached a gospel essentially the same as that of St. Paul. It is a great exaggeration to describe the faith of the Jewish converts as one founded on the correspondence of the facts of the Lord's life to the demands of the Old Testament conception of the Messiah, and requiring merely an application of the natural canons of belief; and to pronounce that which St. Paul demanded of his Gentile disciples, who lived far from the scenes of the Lord's life and from the land of the prophets, to be a gift of grace proceeding immediately from God to the soul. In reality, elements of natural reasoning and of supernatural grace mingled in no unequal degree in the faith both of Jew and Gentile. The Jew accepted the interpretation of the Scriptures which the wise men of his nation rejected and which involved a surrender of their national pride; and this was to him an effort, not of reason alone, but of spirit, which it was impossible to make without the help of the Spirit of God. The Gentile, on the other hand, had the support of natural reason in perceiving the failures and absurdities of the Pagan faith: he was conducted by his Christian teachers through a course of Old Testament instruction, and was taught to be thankful for the inward help of God's grace, and urgent in his prayer for more assistance from on high. But he was never left to believe that the validity of the hope that was in him depended upon an internal and supernatural sanction alone, and that he could not give to himself as well as to others a reason for it which the natural powers of the mind would find sufficient.

We are forced to conclude at this point our notice of Mr. Crozier's work. We thought it better to consider in some

detail his treatment of a passage in the development of the race which both he himself and we regard as supremely important. But there are many preceding chapters in which he traces the development of Greek, Hindoo, and Jewish thought, and many follow in which the evolution of Christianity is further pursued. Everywhere we find patient thought and much knowledge. But we must submit that if supernatural interferences in the Jewish and Christian periods have really as little as he supposes to do with their effects upon mankind, it is a strange coincidence that the persons who have done the great work of those periods have closely connected their own moral and mental lives with the supernatural. If they had lost their supernatural faith they could have done nothing for man's soul or mind. And it was by persuading men to believe in the supernatural that they produced any moral effect. How, then, can we be sure of retaining the moral and intellectual advance made in these great movements if we cast away as useless and untrue the supernatural beliefs to which their origin and propagation have always been inseparably united?

The second work which stands at the head of our article is kindred in its subject to Mr. Crozier's, but we confess that to our minds it is the more welcome that it does not claim to be science. And we cannot perceive that the absence of such a title renders Mr. Taylor at all less careful either of his facts or of his deductions than his brother author. His work is certainly the more convincing for its copious citation of authorities, while that of Mr. Crozier contains no particular references at all. *Ancient Ideals* recognizes the principle of development in its own way.

'Whatever any men have done, what knowledge and accomplishment they have reached, have never been the doers' work. All deeds hang from a past and are conditioned in a present. No man can sever his attainment or even his desire from all that makes it possible. Yet, palpably, accomplishment depends on things without, while man's desire is more nearly his : for it is he. That which has ever purest human interest is the endeavour and the aim' (i. 5).

This passage gives us the object and purpose of the book. It starts from that primitive condition in which man has not yet gained his individuality, but is 'drawn on by the visible pleasant and repelled by the visible ill.' Human growth involves two constant features—desire and consequent action. 'The action involves some realization which represents a growth of personality and in turn becomes an

element.
From
which
of spi
natura
though
though
recogn
law ap
ethica
charac
of a c
by Hi
another
growth
life to
to us,
can h
mind,
of infe
leading

Ce
the co
such a
its var
by the
and va
crown

An
little
immem
people
of a fu
they p
an anc
ception
its sal
other
Egypti
the bo
same li
years
extend
ideas
appare

element of further desires leading to further acts' (i. 7). From the elements of the environment in which he lives, which helps or hinders his action, man frames his thoughts of spirits, demons, and gods. But he comes to perceive that natural objects and powers do not correspond to these thoughts. Yet the brute force of things remains, even though he separates his gods from them, and hence he recognizes a general force in things which becomes fate or law apart from the gods; fate or law advances to possess an ethical character and may even come to possess a personal character and to reveal the idea of God and, further still, that of a common Father, of whom all men are creatures beloved by Him; so that men are members of society and of one another, and all members of God. 'Personality grows in the growth of these conceptions and the endeavour to conform life to them' (*ib.* 9)—a very beautiful statement, as it seems to us, and true in its logical character. At the same time, we can hardly suppose Mr. Taylor to mean that any human mind, or society of minds, ever traversed this wondrous path of inference by its own inherent powers, or without the leading of the Divine Personality itself.

Certainly few subjects can be imagined more worthy of the continued labours of an earnest and accomplished mind such as Mr. Taylor's than the advance of the human race in its various nations, marked by its achievements but still more by the ideals which led to the achievements until the long and varied growth and struggle of effort and aspiration are crowned by Christianity.

And first Egypt, of whose primitive condition we possess little record. The earliest monuments look back on an immense past; and as century followed century this strange people made no advance. They 'elaborated their notions of a future life with endless detail,' and the art with which they pictured them was wonderful: but they never abandoned an ancient notion. Magic incantations enter into their conceptions even of the judgment of the soul, and in order to its salvation its must know the name of the bolts, panels and other parts of the Hall of Truth. The soul is not in the Egyptian conception a spiritual existence, but a double of the bodily life and of inferior quality to the original. The same limitations which confined the race for four thousand years to the same unvaried notions concerning the dead extended also to its beliefs about the gods. Semi-barbarous ideas mingle with more refined. Lofty and ethical faiths, apparently even monotheistic, mingle with those which are

capable of representing the gods as overcome by magical spells and coerced by those of the dead who know the secret charm. The ethics of this wonderful people are also of a mingled character: 'If thou hast become greater after having been little, harden not thy heart because of the elevation; thou art become the steward of the good things of God. Put not behind thee thy neighbour who is like unto thee; be unto him as a companion.' 'The Osiris has done no fraud nor oppression, has caused no one to hunger or to weep, has not robbed the mummies nor falsified the weights of the balance, nor taken milk from the mouths of children' (i. 25). Such gleams of tenderness mingle with the stony hardness of Egyptian morals.

The Chaldean view of life had not the calm of the Egyptian. The land was not healthful, and the enemies were never far away. The Chaldean religion and its prospect beyond the grave is full of darkness and horror. Thus closes the funeral chant:—'Tell, my friend; open the earth.' 'I cannot tell thee, my friend, I cannot tell thee; if I should open the earth to thee, terror and weeping would overcome thee; thou wouldst faint away' (*ib.* 35). But Chaldean religion was not incapable of improvement. The thought of the pains of life begat that of shortcoming in the sufferer. And the powers of the world took a nobler form, supplying that in which man feels himself wanting. And man addresses himself to the higher gods in prayer and worship, confession and penitence. Magic spells, indeed, are not disused; but mercy is ascribed to the gods:—'I sought for help, and none took my hand; I wept, and none stood at my side; I cried aloud, and there was not that heard me; I am in trouble, and hiding; I dare not look up. To my God, the merciful one, I turn myself, I utter my prayer.'

The Chinese religion sacrificed to hills and rivers, and more earnestly still to ancestors. Beyond these was Heaven, for which term God is sometimes substituted. But the terms are equivalent. The ordinances of Heaven are unvarying and prayers and sacrifices unavailing to turn it. There is no personality in God, and no genuine sense of sin in man. 'In the system of Confucius man must look to himself and his own endeavours after right thought and act.' Every rite and ceremony must be duly done, but all must be reached by man's exertions, and to this alone do Confucius's teachings relate (i. 53).

In India the faith in a personal god was reached through the thought of prayer. The word *Brahma*, which means

prayer
prayer
plishm
efficient
(*ib.* 71)

Th
and de
to Bud
man, a
which
of the
ment
rebirth
round
connec
condit
The F
success
the se
nothing

'In
abandon
earth.
the exist
means
reached
himself
The Ab
the first

Th
their o
of Egi
the Gr
the ins
formed
Taylor
in trac
But it
will 'e
its tho
In the
tions a
divinity
The bo
many :

prayer, passes into the meaning of an effectual constraining prayer, which cannot be resisted, and works its own accomplishment; and thus it becomes the name of the absolute efficient Deity reflected in the absolute self of each man (*ib.* 71).

The metaphysical problems, the strivings with change and death which arose out of Brahmanism, led by a revulsion to Buddhism, in which self vanishes, whether as God or as man, and nothing remains but the ceaseless change against which self had been trying to maintain itself. From desire of the objects of the senses comes attachment; from attachment results becoming; from becoming arise birth and rebirth, old age and death, and the continuance of the evil round goes on, unless the subject is free at death from desires connected with individuality. If he has reached this blessed condition he happily vanishes into Nirvana and extinction. The Buddhistic Karma is the individual identity through successive lives, which are not merely scenes through which the self passes, but are themselves the self, for there is nothing behind them.

'India in Brahmanism, and then more completely in Buddhism, abandoned as worthless or as painful the content of men's lives on earth. Scorning individuality as change and death, it abandoned the existence of the human individual, the basis of life, the only means whereby that which transcends the individual can be reached. Man cannot gain God unless man continues to exist himself. Indian thought reaches not conclusions but catastrophes. The Absolute All One—Brahma, and the Atma, which was It—was the first leap into the void; the second was Nirvana' (i. 103).

The Hittites and the Phœnicians do not furnish much in their own spiritual aspirations to connect the great religions of Egypt and the East with the desires or attainments of the Greek mind. They seemingly resembled the wind or the insect which carries the seed from the place where it is formed to the soil which is capable of receiving it. Mr. Taylor's chapter on 'Greek Beginnings' is of much interest in tracing the progress of Mycenæan art and ancient song. But it is in Homer that the Greek spirit comes to birth. It will 'endure nothing vague or abstract, but must visualize its thoughts and understandings in its creations' (i. 155). In the gods of Homer human life is freed from such limitations as it could lay aside and still remain itself. 'Olympian divinity is humanity enlarged along the lines of artistic truth.' The body of man is himself. 'The wrath of Achilles sent many spirits of heroes to Hades and gave *themselves* as a

prey to dogs.' The shades were but fluttering images of men outworn (*ib.* 161). Archbishop Whately was wont to say that the Greeks, unable to make up their minds to draw from the facts of life a decided inference either that there was no future or that there was, compromised matters by believing in a future life half way between reality and non-existence. They could not restrain their imaginations as the Hebrews, with a clearness of thought equal to theirs, could do, in respect to the life beyond the grave. The Greek was obliged to represent to himself the shade of Hercules or Achilles dimly seen, and with all the vigour and beauty gone. And over all human life broods Fate or Destiny—not a Calvinistic or a Mohammedan power, which reduces will to unreality, yet shaping human life and ruling the gods themselves.

The materials of Greek religion and the Greek conceptions of life and morals were not of a cast-iron quality, but capable of variation and improvement in the hands of the bright race which busied itself in thought and action with such intensity. In Æschylus, in Sophocles, the intellect of the poet strives with the terrible problem of unintentional guilt and its punishment or expiation, and almost reaches the idea of forgiveness of deliberate guilt.

'Since the functions of Greek gods never broadened to control all life, Greek thought constantly varies—now bringing more of life, now less, and again nothing, it may be, within the scope of the deity's control. The poets hold the gods personified, and tend to see most of life lying in divine hands. The philosophers take from the gods distinct individuality, anon all personality, and tend to see law everywhere and over all' (i. 219).

But when the question of the highest good for man comes to be debated there must be a union of the abstract and the personal, and the gods must be, as man desires for himself, beings truly existing, but in the enjoyment of the widest and most lasting exercise of the faculty which least submits to bounds and limitations. The highest good of man must be an end in itself. It consists in the activity and realization of his reason—that is, his highest nature, characteristic of him alone among the creatures, capable of more continuous exercise than any other faculty, and of promoting happiness through the greatest length of time. The philosopher's life of thought is the highest life, and nearest the divine; for we cannot conceive of God as exercising the ordinary virtues, but as contemplating and reasoning eternally.

This 'would be perfect happiness, if prolonged through a life of

full dur
is not a
divine
our con
to the
divine,
routine
bid us
indulge
partic
yet in
nature,
ance wi
life can

Th
ment o
ideal.
anythi
realize
fection
lies wi
Th
not to
of Rom
race a
as age
to the
power
and th
busine
private
East.
to rev
streng
were f
success
set bef
Th
growing
and of
Mr. T
But 'i
Greek
fold, co

full duration. Such a life, however, would be superhuman, for it is not as being man that one will live thus, but by virtue of a certain divine element subsisting within us. Just as this element far excels our composite nature, so does its operation excel action according to the moral virtues. Reason in comparison with man is something divine, and so is the life of reason divine in comparison with the routine of a man's life. One must not, however, obey those who bid us think humbly, as being mortal men; nay, rather, we should indulge immortal longings, and strive to live up to that divine particle within us which, though it be small in proportionate bulk, yet in power and dignity far surpasses all the other parts of our nature, and is, indeed, each man's proper self. By living in accordance with it our true individuality will be developed, and such a life cannot fail to be happy above all other kinds of life.¹

This wonderful passage seems to show the highest attainment of Greek thought. But it plainly shows it to us as an ideal. It is an ideal which it professes to set before us, not anything that man has either compassed or can hope to realize. And even as an ideal it displays gaps and imperfections which we who know a higher ideal, and one which lies within our hope, can discern.

The Roman religion was one of observance, which did not touch the heart. It was identified with the institutions of Rome which embodied the energy and resolution of the race and strengthened those qualities in their turn: so that, as ages of conquest succeeded each other, the State became to the old Roman the most divine existence known; the power and aggrandizement of the State became his ideal, and the old gods being all occupied as it were in State business, whatever divinities were wanted for purposes of private devotion or superstition were imported from the East. And though the Empire saw more than one attempt to revive religion under its ancient names, the purposes of strengthening the State with which these efforts were made were too palpable to give such a religion any chance of success with minds which had learnt in a better school to set before themselves ideals more spiritual.

The development of the Hebrew personality lay in the growing appreciation of the thought of the one personal God and of man created in His image (ii. 97). 'The Hebrews,' as Mr. Taylor acutely remarks, 'heard rather than saw God.' But 'in its very different way Hebrew thought was as clear as Greek thought. The Greek gift of style was far more manifold, corresponding with the manifold content of Greek life;

¹ Aristotle, trans. by Grant, quoted in i. 342.

the Hebrew gift was as strong and great, fitted to tell Israel's story of God's purpose with her and her thoughts of Him' (ii. 173). The analysis which the author gives of the mind of this wonderful nation and its inspired literature is fully equal to his treatment of the classic nations. But we must not linger upon it. We hasten forward to the discussion of Christianity.

It does not, of course, come within the scope of *Ancient Ideals* to discuss the evidences for the truth of our religion. The author but states his own position, 'that he can see no explanation of the Christian faith except on the assumption that the resurrection of Christ actually occurred.' That this event is 'in itself a matter most difficult to believe' no Christian need deny. We go with him thoroughly in pronouncing it vain to expect complete scientific treatment of the origin of Christianity. 'When its antecedents have been pointed out; when its scope and the conditions of its rapid spread have been indicated, its existence is still unaccounted for; no adequate cause has been shown' (ii. 234). And,

'if it is impossible to treat the origin of Christianity scientifically, it is for somewhat analogous reasons impossible to set forth Christianity systematically. Life transcends systematization. The story of a human life may be told, though perhaps never adequately. . . . The greater the personality, the more will the life defy reduction to system, even defy analysis' (ii. 239).

We set these wise and beautiful words against Mr. Crozier's attempt to make a scientific analysis of the Gospel history. And with reference to the notion of the kingdom of God and its speedy appearance, which he ascribes to the Lord, we could hardly find better words than those of Mr. Taylor: 'There is deep consistency between the fourth Gospel and Christ's way of speaking of the kingdom of heaven sometimes as a kingdom almost palpably to come, sometimes as a spiritual condition which may exist now among men as well as hereafter' (ii. 286). Or, again, 'Philosophy had no idea that a man's capacity for apprehending some far truth might depend, not on his reason alone, but on his goodness, his lovingness, and the range of his feeling' (ii. 343). Christianity announced that God's relationship to man was love, and pointed to the Christ on earth. It announced that 'love was man's relationship to God: it founded man's love of God on man's whole nature, heart and mind, responding to God's love of man; and then it filled out man's love of God with all of earth's realities of love and

kindly
which
this fin
mend i

It h
infinite
Absolu
craving
that wi
human
of men
lower p
and the
Roman
was an
ethic,
human
Christi
stamp t
Jewish

'Christi
absolute,
and furth
scope for
and for t
was real,
and man

We mu
teaching
inspired
not be c
and the
longer e
mankind
tions in
in the S
also be c
we know
for we sh

We c
gratitude
of study
And eve
lections

VOL. 2

kindly act of man to man' (ii. 345). Many beautiful passages which we had marked tempt us to pursue our extracts from this fine work, but we trust we have said enough to recommend it to the reader.

It has shown us Hinduism reaching the conception of the infinite and finding that in the eternal and unchanging Absolute and not in finite things is the satisfaction of man's craving. Buddhism tore down this structure so completely that with the downfall of the Absolute fell both God and the human soul. But Israel is the most complete ancient example of men centring their interests in relationship to God. The lower plane of human development belonged to the Greek and the Roman. The latter was the simpler contribution. Roman ethics were strict and stern, and Roman religion was an adjunct to the State and the family. But Greek ethic, art and philosophy furnished a combination of human endeavour upon all sides so great that in its final Christian home it has retained more of its own independent stamp than any other of the prechristian achievements except Jewish Theism. But

'Christianity as contained in the life and teachings of Christ was absolute, in that it included and set forth the fulfilment of the highest and furthest possibilities of life; it was universal, in that it afforded scope for the inclusion of all qualities and possibilities of mankind and for the development of the whole man in the service of God; it was real, in that it was founded on veritable relations between God and man' (ii. 398).

We must not consider the limitation to the 'life and teachings of Christ' as excluding His ascended life and the inspired life of His Church; without which our faith could not be called the fulfilment of the furthest possibilities of life, and the veritable relations between God and man would no longer exist for the men of to-day. In Christ the ideals of mankind are realized once for all. They renew their aspirations in each individual, but faith holds them accomplished in the Saviour and looks forward to the time when they shall also be our own. 'We know not yet what we shall be, but we know that when He shall appear we shall be like Him, for we shall see Him as He is.'

We close the work of Mr. Taylor with feelings of hearty gratitude to him. He has led us through a lengthened course of study in which he everywhere refers us to original sources. And everywhere the transatlantic scholar illustrates his collections with very masterly thought of his own. We add his

VOL. XLV.—NO. LXXXIX.

K

book to the excellent library which teaches of 'Christ and Other Masters,' and we verily believe that few of those admirable authors who have treated the noble theme excel him for width of view and discriminating insight.

ART. VII.—THE CELTIC CHURCH IN WALES.

The Celtic Church in Wales. By J. W. WILLIS BUND.
(London, 1897.)

So much new interest has been directed towards the history and characteristics of early institutions in recent years, and such a flood of light has been thrown upon them, that they may almost be said to have been rediscovered in our own day. The increased availableness of early records in critical editions, the publication of primitive codes of law of all kinds, and the study of still existing Slavonic and Hindu institutions, have first made this new light possible. Then has come the great work of scholars, such as Schrader, Fustel de Coulanges, and our own Sir Henry Maine (not to speak of many others now living), in comparing and illustrating and revivifying the huge collections of material thus placed at our disposal, until there stands out before us a whole field of knowledge hitherto entirely unexplored.

Celtic institutions—Irish and Scotie and Welsh—occupy by no means the smallest part of this new field. The publication of the Brehon and Welsh laws, and a great mass of other material, with the work of a generation or more of great scholars, has completely changed the outlook of Celtic history. For side by side with the increased knowledge of Celtic tribal institutions, the work of Dr. Todd, Bishop Reeves, Dr. Skene, Dr. Hennessy, and many more has opened up to us such enlarged views of Celtic Christendom that the work of such giants of learning as Ussher and Colgan, though still of priceless value, has become in many ways out of date.

So far, however, the study of Welsh Christendom has not advanced in anything like the same proportion as that of Ireland and Iona. In everything that concerns Welsh literature and history, the growth of our knowledge is immense. Professor Rhys has made many things live for us which were hitherto meaningless, and his work, we trust, is still not half done. We may hope, too, that Mr. Seebohm's published

work
studi
Chris
indee
Chur
which
close
value
no s
as W
where
has b
not a
facts
work
jointe
does
huma
exagg
histor
devel
form
equal
labour
tine

In
essay
place
for Ir
writen
Celtic
matte
and t
ideas
Abov
light

'T
succes
applie
local c
and So
that w
shown
pages
nected
some

rist and
of those
me excel

ALES.

BUND.

e history
ears, and
that they
our own
in critical
aw of all
nd Hindu
le. Then
er, Fustel
to speak
illustrating
us placed
whole field

—occupy
The publi-
t mass of
r more of
of Celtic
nowledge of
d, Bishop
s opened
dom that
d Colgan,
many ways

m has not
as that of
Welsh lite-
s immense.
which were
ll not half
published

work on Welsh tribal institutions is but the first fruits of his studies on the subject. But as regards the history of Welsh Christianity there has been far less to speak of. Sometimes indeed it has been well studied as an adjunct to English Church history, in which case, of course, those features which are most closely related to English life have been most closely investigated, and this from the point of view of their value for English Church history. Then, again, it is certain that no small part of what has from time to time passed muster as Welsh Church history is nothing but fable. Whilst even where this element has been more or less eliminated, there has been a constant tendency to look at things from a Latin, not a Celtic, point of view, and to translate and adapt the facts of Welsh Christianity so as to make them fit the framework of Latin ecclesiastical life. Naturally enough, the disjointed story which is fitted upon such a bed of Procrustes does not always present to us the genuine features of a true human life at all. Whereas there is little, if anything, of exaggeration in Mr. Willis Bund's words when he says: 'The history of the organization of the Celtic tribes, and the development of Christianity working on that organization, form a page of Church history quite as interesting and equally important for Englishmen as that describing the labours of St. Martin of Tours, or the mission of St. Augustine' (p. 95).

In the remarkable book which has given the title to this essay Mr. Willis Bund has endeavoured to supply the vacant place, and to do in a measure for Wales what has been done for Ireland, Iona, and indeed for nearly all Scotland, by other writers. It has been his object to see the facts from the Celtic point of view, avoiding 'the usual endeavour to bring matters into order by trying to explain the rules, customs, and the acts of the Celtic Church by the light of Latin ideas, and in accordance with Latin modes of thought' (p. 5). Above all, he has tried to study Welsh Christianity by the light of Irish and Scottish. For

'The comparative method of study that was applied with such success by Sir Henry Maine and others to jurisprudence can . . . be applied to some extent in Church history. By a comparison of the local customs that existed in Wales with those that existed in Ireland and Scotland, a flood of light is thrown on the early Church. Much that was formerly little better than mere conjecture can now be shown with some certainty to be fact. An attempt is made in these pages to apply this method to certain points of Church history connected with the Welsh Celtic Church. It will be admitted that, to some extent, there was identity in the views of the Irish and Welsh

Churches. There were, it is true, local variations, but in the main the beliefs and observances were the same. The Irish records give, with some minuteness, the details of the practice of the Irish Celtic Church on various matters, such as, for instance, the mutual relations existing between the Church and the tribe. By the aid of these details it is possible to fill in a picture of the Celtic Church, and to note many of its peculiar customs and observances. Taking such a picture as a starting-point, and using it to examine Welsh customs and Welsh documents, some outlines of the ideas prevailing in Wales on Church matters may be gained. These ideas will be found to correspond in various details with those prevailing in Ireland; the result will therefore be to show that, though not in name, yet in fact, similar customs and observances existed among both Irish and Welsh. It is a fair inference that both had a common origin, that both are the development of the same ideas, modified or affected by their different local surroundings' (pp. 6, 7).

To say that *The Celtic Church in Wales* supplies for the Welsh Church the same place as is occupied for Iona by Bishop Reeves's monumental work, or by the second volume of Dr. Skene's *Celtic Scotland* for the whole of Northern Britain, would be entirely misleading. The book has many defects, as it will be our duty to show presently; some resulting, as we venture to think, from mistaken inferences from the history itself, or from theories of the author as to the origin of Church institutions, and others from a certain want of familiarity with the history of other parts of the Church during the period with which he is dealing. In particular, he seems to assume that many things which he finds in the Celtic Churches were peculiar to them, when a greater familiarity with the beginnings of Teutonic Christianity would have shown him that they are to be found quite generally there too. Moreover, the book is not a little involved in method; to such a degree, indeed, as to present considerable difficulty to a reader who does not possess some degree of familiarity with the subject already. Mr. Willis Bund deals with it in a succession of essays, on 'Characteristics of the Welsh Church,' 'The Tribal System,' 'The Christian Settlement,' 'Monasteries,' 'Bishops,' and so on. The result is that not only is there a certain amount of unavoidable repetition, but some things have to be, so to speak, assumed by way of anticipation in the earlier chapters which are not fully treated of till later on in the book. We are far from saying that this could have been entirely avoided; indeed, in the present state of knowledge upon the subject, we are not sure that it would have been possible to set to work otherwise. If it was still impossible, however, to deal with the subject otherwise

than
that
But
most
appea
the p
others
done.
richer
parati
one's
blemis
criticis
ciated

W
said t
use of
Mr. V
anticip
that t
were c
and o
form
they
Churc
was i
individu
of Ch
And
Catho
into C
to the
these
them,
accor
been
phrase
some
remen
organ
being
bodies
same
relatio
Paul

than by way of somewhat disconnected essays, it only follows that the history of Welsh Christianity has yet to be written. But at least Mr. Willis Bund's book will remain as the most valuable contribution to the subject that has yet appeared; and he will have the satisfaction which belongs to the pioneer who first lays down the roadway along which others pass the more easily on account of what he has already done. Others may enter into his labours, but he is the richer, not the poorer, for that fact. And whilst it is a comparatively easy thing, by the light of his own work, to place one's finger upon certain things which would appear to be blemishes in that work, it would be a foolish and ungenerous criticism which considered that his work was to be depreciated on that account.

We now proceed to give some account of what may be said to be known of early Christianity in Wales, making full use of the new light on the subject which has been supplied by Mr. Willis Bund. We use the word *Wales*, of course, by anticipation; for it was only at a comparatively late period that their enemies gave to the Celtic peoples whom they were driving into the West the name of *Wealas* or foreigners, and only at a yet later date that this name (in its modern form of Wales) came to be given to the land itself in which they dwelt. And we speak of *Christianity* rather than Church, because we believe that the idea of a Welsh Church was in the earliest days unknown. There were indeed individual Churches, consisting of the particular local bodies of Christians with their bishop (or bishops) and clergy. And these local Churches of course formed part of the Catholic Church at large, the body of those who are baptized into Christ. But the evidence would seem clearly to point to the conclusion that there was no such organization of these individual bodies, and no such mutual relations between them, as would justify us in speaking of them as a Church according to later ideas. No little misunderstanding has been fostered by careless language in this matter. The phrase 'the Celtic Church' is no doubt a convenient one for some purposes; but it is altogether misleading unless we remember that it denotes nothing in the way of common organized life; and that as this organized life tardily came into being it was never one, but manifold. In fact, the various bodies of Celtic Christians would appear to have been in the same sort of condition (at least as regards their mutual relations) as the Christians of Asia Minor were when St. Paul 'went through Syria and Cilicia confirming the

Churches,'¹ and when he wrote to the Church at Corinth for instance, or Laodicea or Galatia, and conveyed to them the salutations of other Churches. They possessed already, indeed, all that was essential to the organized life of the Christian society; but it may fairly be doubted whether they did not lack many things which Christian experience has shown to belong to the *bene esse* of the Church.

On the very obscure question of the origin of Christianity in Wales very different opinions have been held. Professor Hugh Williams, for instance, is of the opinion that 'there was no really British Church, that is a Church of the native Celtic inhabitants, before the fifth century,' and that all the earlier Christians 'were, if I am not mistaken, not men of British blood, but Romans in language and culture, probably also in race.'² 'It is difficult to believe,' he goes on, 'that there were Christian Churches in Wales *before the beginning* of that century;' but in order to explain the facts at the time of the visits of St. Germanus, he is driven to admit that '*the first thirty years of the fifth century appear to have comprised a period of rapid conversion*' (pp. 14, 15). This is quite undue scepticism; and by the light of the known intercourse of Celts with the mainland, it is impossible to doubt that most, at any rate of those who are spoken of before this date as British Christians, must have been really British by birth. At the other pole is the extravagant dream of some Welshmen of former days, that Aristobulus was consecrated by St. Paul as first bishop of the Britons, and that the two together afterwards came to Britain, where St. Paul resided for a time at St. Donat's Castle, and afterwards preached the gospel at Llantwit Major.³ As against these views, it is natural to think that Christianity entered Wales, as Mr. Newell suggests, along the great Roman road 'which led by Glevum or Gloucester through the stations of Venta Silurum (Caerwent) and Isca Silurum (Caerleon) by Cardiff to Nidum (Neath) and Maridunum (Carmarthen)' (p. 17). And Mr. Willis Bund is probably not far from right in dating its establishment about A.D. 300 (p. 421); although the evidence which we have to go upon is of the very slightest character. For if, as Mr. Haverfield says,⁴ Caerleon was never a colony, it follows that it cannot be the Colonia Londinensium (or Legionen-

¹ Acts xv. 41.

² *Some Aspects of the Christian Church in Wales during the Fifth and Sixth Centuries.* By Hugh Williams, M.A., Professor of Church History at the Theological College, Bala, pp. 3, 4.

³ See Newell, *A History of the Welsh Church*, p. 5.

⁴ *English Historical Review* for July 1896, p. 418.

sium)
only
marty
migh

B
servic
Bryth
woul
tively
seize

'S
berlan
in the
gomen
were
Atreba
the D

H
were
was,
polyt
believ
of ste
inhab
loped
and c
over
depos
religi
its tra
move
a va
Creat
powe
Japan
local
been

1 C
3 S
follow
Druid
(p. 10)
that t
Druid
and th
Bryth

sium) whose bishop went to Arles in A.D. 314. And we have only the vague statement of Gildas and Bede as to the martyrdom of Aaron and Julius at Legionum Urbs, which might be either Caerleon or Chester.¹

But Mr. Willis Bund has done us one of his most valuable services in pointing out how entirely different were the Brythons and Goidels, the two peoples with whom Christianity would have to deal in the East and West of Britain respectively, and the different ways in which, consequently, it would seize hold of and affect those peoples.

'Speaking broadly, the Brythons held all England, except Cumberland in the north, Cornwall, Devon, Wilts, and part of Somerset in the south, but in Wales only the wedge which consisted of Montgomery, Merioneth, and North Cardigan. The Brythonic tribes were the Brigantes, Coritavi, Cornavii, Ordovices, Dobunnii, Belgæ, Atrebatæ, Catuvelauni, Iceni, and Cantii. The Goidelic tribes were the Durotriges, Damnonii,² Silures, and Dimetæ' (p. 101).

He goes on to show that the religions of these two races were entirely distinct. Whilst the religion of the Brython was, 'in the main, that of the Gaulish Celts'—an easygoing polytheism 'which was willing to worship anything or to believe anything'—the religion of the Goidels was made of sterner stuff. They had adopted Druidism from the older inhabitants of the Western lands, the Iverni,³ but had developed it with features all their own. Their religion was stern and cruel, regulated in all details by the Druids, who presided over the sacrifices (sometimes of human beings) and were the depositaries of the remarkable miscellaneous lore of Goidelic religion. They believed in 'the immortality of the soul and its transmigration into other bodies;' they were skilled in 'the movements of the planets and the laws of nature.' They held a vague pantheistic doctrine of the relation between the Creator and the creature; and, meanwhile, with a strange power of adaptation not unlike that of Shinto-worshippers in Japan, they seem still to have found room for numbers of local deities, or deified powers of Nature, which may have been part of their original Celtic religion.

¹ Gildas, *Hist.* c. 8; Bede, i. 7.

² Wrongly printed 'Danmonii.'

³ Such is the account of the matter given by Professor Rhys, and followed by Mr. Willis Bund: 'The Goidelic Celts seem to have adopted Druidism, which was certainly not originally a Celtic form of religion' (p. 105). But we have never seen a satisfactory explanation of the fact that there is, so far as we are aware, no evidence of the prevalence of Druidism among the Iverni of Spain or their descendants the Basques, and that it existed amongst the Gaulish Celts, who were akin to the Brythons.

Now it is easy to see how differently the new faith would have to deal with these two peoples—

'When Christianity came, this miscellaneous polytheism [of the Goidels] was abolished, but that was all. The old worship and philosophy remained; the Druid became the poet, the hereditary poet of the tribe, but he no longer relied, for the supernatural power he still claimed to possess, on magic arts, but on the Divine aid. He ceased to be a magician, and became a miracle-worker. His philosophy the missionaries swallowed wholesale, but as the Irish laws were revised at Tara by the Christian missionary, so was the Druidic philosophy revised by the Christian missionary in Wales, and, so revised, it became the basis of the faith of the Celtic Church. Thus, when the Christian missionary came to Britain he had to deal with two different sets of ideas. The Brythonic religion, which was idolatry pure and simple; here the Christian could make no terms, accept no compromise. The Goidelic religion, which was philosophy *plus* idolatry. Here the Christian could agree, if the idolatry was got rid of, to allow the philosophy to remain. So in Britain, Christianity having to deal with two very different states of things, treated them in different ways—with the one, extermination; with the other, toleration' (p. 107).

This is all most excellent, and we have never before seen it so clearly stated. But we are quite unable to accept what follows. Mr. Willis Bund appears to have very peculiar views as to the effect of Roman law upon Christian doctrines. 'No one,' he says, 'who has ever read any old Roman lawyer, such as Gaius and his account of the ceremony of adoption, but may be trusted to name the sources from which a large part of the Christian, or rather the Pauline, doctrine of baptism, and its effects is taken' (p. 60). After this it is nothing to be told that, 'in all probability, fosterage formed the origin of sponsorship, which was an ecclesiastical adaptation of the system, and the tie that was created between the godfather and godchild closely resembled, in many respects, the tie between the foster parent and foster child' (p. 67). But even so, we are fairly surprised when he gravely informs us that

'the Latin Church, adopting the idea of the Latin lawyers that a man succeeded not only to all the property, but also to all the liabilities of his ancestor, taught that the descendants of Adam had inherited, not only Adam's rights, but also his liabilities, one of which was the responsibility for his sin. It is a curious instance of the effect on religious belief of the system of Roman law. The Eastern Church and the Goidelic Celts, neither of whom fell under the rule of the Roman lawyer, were never troubled with the importance of the doctrine of original sin' (p. 107).

Here we can only stand aghast. It is of course easy to

underst
Roman
blance
one wh
upon t
fairly h
have k
taught
for his

In
observe
have i
teaches
works,
he trav
the Go
tenden
the orig
clusion
Goidels
is usual
that th
doctrin

'WH
centre,
extent is
of Engl
gianism,
of the c

Now
facts do
take fa
every s
the her
the blu
origin o
exercis
propou
it is cle
his life
was gr
upon h
was his
any wa
he repr

understand how one who had never read anything but a few Roman lawyers might be misled by the superficial resemblance here alluded to ; but we fail to understand how anyone who had taken the slightest trouble to inform himself upon the subject could write such nonsense. And it might fairly have been expected that the author of this book should have known better than to think that the Latin Church ever taught that Adam's descendants inherited 'the responsibility for his sin.'

In the next place, Mr. Willis Bund has very acutely observed that Pelagianism, which denies that Adam's children have inherited any incapacity as the result of Adam's sin, teaches that every man may win his salvation by his own works, and is in fact the very antithesis of the doctrine which he travesties above, was just of such a nature as to appeal to the Goidelic Celts, with their philosophy and their pantheistic tendencies. And, holding the views already mentioned as to the origin of the Latin doctrine, he naturally jumps at the conclusion that Pelagianism was simply the ordinary creed of the Goidels, that 'the faith of the Goidelic Celts, as above stated, is usually called, from its great exponent, Pelagianism,' and that the Romanized Brythons naturally accepted the 'Latin' doctrine.

'While Goidelic Britain became moved by Pelagianism to its centre, Brythonic Britain seems hardly to have felt it. To such an extent is this the case, that if a map was prepared showing the parts of England and Wales which were affected or otherwise by Pelagianism, it would be found that the map showed roughly the division of the country between the Goidel and the Brython' (p. 108).

Now we believe that most of this is purely visionary ; the facts do not in the least bear out the theory. (1) It would take far too long to deal with the matter in detail here ; but every student of the history of Pelagianism knows well that the heresy was, as concerns the Church at large, no 'bolt from the blue,' but had its origin in those questionings as to the origin of the soul and the nature of the will which had been exercising men's minds for generations previous to the actual propounding of the heresy. With regard to Pelagius himself, it is clear that most of his learning was acquired, as most of his life was spent, on the Continent, and that his doctrine was gradually formulated in the face of the attacks made upon him. With the exception of the Scot Cœlestius, who was his second self, there is not a word to suggest that he in any way represented the faith of his own land, still less that he represented the Goidel, not the Brython, belief. In later

days the chief stronghold of the heresy was amongst the people of Southern Gaul, whose affinities were with the Brythons, not the Goidels. And the different position which the controversy undoubtedly occupied in East and West is to be accounted for, not by the prevalence or absence of Roman law, but by those far larger differences of race and character between East and West, of which the Roman law itself is but one of the symptoms.

(2) Nor are we able to accept the second part of the statement, that Pelagianism was mainly prevalent in Goidelic Britain. It is based, apparently, upon an attempt to trace the route of St. Germanus by the churches dedicated to him, and an assumption that this would cover the parts of the island where Pelagianism was more prevalent. But (a) it is clear that the dedications of churches to Germanus, even if it proved that he had visited those places, could give only a very inadequate view of his journeyings, since churches would only be built by a person coming on a special mission, such as that of Germanus, in places where they were needed, not where they already existed. And we should naturally suppose—and especially on Mr. Willis Bund's theory—that Pelagianism was most common where there already were churches. (b) Moreover, we have early evidence that the most important seat of St. Germanus's work was not in Wales at all; for the great council in which the Pelagians were defeated was apparently at or near Verulamium. Such, at least, seems to be the clear meaning of Constantine in his (practically contemporary) *Life of St. Germanus*.¹ To this must be added the fact that the legendary or traditional accounts associate the Pelagian Fastidius with London; and that at any rate it would be hard to think that he and Faustus of Riez, not to speak of others, were Goidels. (c) Nor is the evidence of the dedications themselves in any way decisive. There are, it is true, four churches dedicated to St. Germanus in Wales—Llanarmon in Iâl and Llanarmon Dyffryn Ceiriog, both in Denbighshire, St. Harmon's in Radnorshire, and Llanfechain in Montgomeryshire; and four chapels—Llanarmon under Llanybi and Bettws Garmon under Llanfair Isgaer, both in Carnarvonshire, and in Denbighshire Capel Garmon under Llanrwst and Llanarmon Fach under Llandegfan.² But of

¹ *Const. Vit. S. Germ.* i. 23, 25; and see Haddan and Stubbs, i. 18, note c.

² Newell, *op. cit.* p. 36. To these must be added St. Germanus's in Cornwall, and probably others. There are also two churches dedicated to St. Lupus or Bleiddian in Wales—Llanfleiddian Fawr and Fach in Glamorganshire.

these,
thoni
is now
British
the la
bearing
very f
founde
not rec
and M
think
any ra
always
Church
frequ
that ev

Th
tianity
less M
its pre
history
just as
them f
whole
some
which

Lit
Welsh
beginn
howeve

¹ *Op*
² *For*

the north
such a
at Maes
Achau
the Cyn
statement
p. 158 f.
recently
original
derived)
Britain i
and he t
ipse Hel
ordinavi
86. In
it seems

these, as Mr. Willis Bund notices, Llanfechain was in Brythonic territory; and the absence or scarcity of others in what is now England is amply accounted for by the destruction of British Christianity by the Saxons. Moreover, in spite of the late Professor Rees's theory, that the early churches bearing the name of a saint were founded by that saint, it is very far from certain that the *Germanus* churches were really founded by him. Professor Rhys is of opinion that they did not receive that name in the age in which St. German lived; and Mr. Newell doubts whether he was ever in Wales.¹ We think that there is sufficient evidence that he was.² But at any rate, considering the way in which the Welsh Churches always asserted their identity with the Romano-British Church, there is no possible reason for accounting for the frequency of such dedications in Wales by the supposition that every one marks an actual visit of Germanus.

The theory, then, that Pelagianism was Goidelic Christianity collapses entirely for want of evidence; but none the less Mr. Willis Bund has done a service in pointing out that its prevalence is to be accounted for by something in the life-history of the people who held it. And it may well be that, just as the mythology of the Teutonic peoples predisposed them for the low Arian conception of the Son of God, so the whole temper of the Northern Celts predisposed them to the somewhat shallow view of sin, and consequently of grace, which is perhaps the most noticeable feature of Pelagianism.

Little or nothing can be said to be known certainly as to Welsh history before the departure of the Romans and the beginning of the invasions of Britain by the English. Then, however, comes a change. Somewhere about the time of

¹ *Op. cit.* p. 34; cf. p. 36.

² For (1) the way in which the *Germanus* churches are clustered in the northern part of Wales certainly suggests some local reason; and such a reason is at once supplied if the Alleluia Battle really took place at Maes Garmon near Mold. (2) Not to speak of the late legend in the *Achau y Saint*, that Germanus founded 'two choirs of saints' amongst the Cymry (Rice Rees, *Essay on the Welsh Saints*, p. 122), and the statements in the late Life of St. Iltud (W. J. Rees, *Cambro-British Saints*, p. 158 f.), there is early, nearly contemporary, evidence for it in the recently edited Life of St. Samson (*Anal. Bollandiana*, vol. vi.: it is the original Life from which that in Mabillon, *Acta SS. Ord. Bened.*, is derived). The writer of this Life tells us that he crossed the sea to Britain in order to obtain his information from Samson's own cousin; and he tells us with regard to St. Iltud, who is clearly a Welshman, 'et ipse Heldutus discipulus erat sancti Germani episcopi, et ipse Germanus ordinavit eum in sua iuventute, in gradum presbyteratus'—*ubi supr.* p. 86. In the face of such a statement, dating from about the year 600 A.D., it seems impossible to doubt that Germanus had been in Wales.

Germanus's first visit there began a series of invasions of 'Wales,' which continued for a century and more. They are very constantly to be traced in the earliest genuine Welsh literature,¹ and must have entirely changed the whole character and destiny of the country. Some of the earliest were, perhaps, inroads of Picts from the far North, and against these the Alleluia Battle may have been fought. Others, again, were from Ireland; they form part of a constantly renewing intercourse, sometimes peaceful, sometimes warlike, between Wales and Ireland, which had very far-reaching effects on both, and have left their traces upon both to this day.² More than once Irish Christianity received renewed vigour from the Welsh 'wise men and monks;' on the other hand, the debt was repaid in some measure by the pilgrimages of Irish holy men to Wales, and in particular by the visits made by Irish bishops for the purpose of ordaining and consecrating, as in the case of St. Kentigern.³ Above all, there was the conquest made by those who are known to readers of Dr. Skene as 'the mysterious Brychan and his family,' who were unquestionably of Irish birth and character. They came to Wales and established themselves in what is now Breconshire; and there his people, who were evidently as profoundly Christian as they were Irish,⁴ gradually worked themselves in amongst the people of the land.

But in particular, the beginning of this period⁵ saw the great invasion by Cunedda and his sons, which was destined to have a larger share in the making of Wales, strictly

¹ In *The Four Ancient Books of Wales*, passim; and see Mr. Skene's most valuable prefaces.

² We may mention in particular the jealous dislike of the North Welsh for the Irish which is mentioned many times over by George Borrow in his *Wild Wales*. It is to be noticed still, especially at the times when the invasions of the Irish are continued in the more peaceful shape of the annual visits of Irish harvest labourers to this island.

In many parts of both South and North Wales, but especially in Carnarvonshire and Merionethshire, are to be found the remains of great stone fortifications raised by the invaders for their own defence, and still connected with them by the people. In particular may be mentioned the remarkable *Muriau y Gwyddelod* on the hills behind Harlech.

³ Jocelyn, *Vit. S. Kentigerni*, c. 11.

⁴ 'It is remarkable that all through the Brychan legend there is a constant reference to Ireland and Irish Christianity. It therefore seems to follow that this great saint-producing family were foreigners, who established themselves in Central Wales and who spread a Christianity among the Welsh which, if not pure Irish, was yet something very closely related to it.'—Willis Bund, p. 431.

⁵ Professor Rhys dates the invasion of Cunedda and his sons 'somewhere very near the departure of the Romans from Britain'—*Celtic Britain*, p. 120; Mr. Willis Bund 'about 400, or a little later' (p. 53).

so cal
Mr. W
those
Cuned
and his
vasions
'consid
Wales
sugges
or else
Cuned
No
the fac
known
is high
Iverni
St. Nir
the so-
by the
shut of
armies
southw
almost
to see
It is fa
that Cu
an aut
gathere
who be

¹ P.
probably
were Ch
that, tho
Welsh G
querors
Christian
South W
is said to
beyond t
'Cunedda
derived f
These
somewha
self in a
² 'Sp
of those
Tribal S
³ Skene

so called, than anything else whatever. And here again Mr. Willis Bund seems to hold views which differ widely from those of other writers on the subject. According to him Cunedda was a Pict from the north,¹ perhaps not a Christian, and his coming was simply one of a number of 'foreign' invasions of Wales. The influence of this family was indeed 'considerable, both in the civil and ecclesiastical history of Wales' (p. 428). But this is all; and indeed it is distinctly suggested that to be a saint a man must either be illegitimate, or else of some 'foreign' or non-Welsh race such as that of Cunedda (p. 443).

Now this theory seems to us untenable and contrary to the facts. The doubt as to the real origin of the Picts is well known; but in spite of their name of the Gwyddel Fichti, it is highly probable that they were a non-Celtic people like the Iverni. And although the land of Galloway, to which St. Ninian went, was occupied by an outlying Pictish race, the so-called Niduari Picts, yet they were entirely hemmed in by the Celts of Strathclyde; and the Picts of the north were shut off from Southern Britain by the same obstacle. Pictish armies might, and did, break their way through and pierce southwards; but the invasion of Cunedda and his sons was almost of the nature of a folk-wandering;² and it is less easy to see how this could have taken place through such a barrier. It is far more probable, as Skene and Professor Rhys hold,³ that Cunedda, perhaps by means of some vague remnant of an authority derived from office under the Empire, had gathered together a great federation of Celts, mainly Brythons, who became known by the name of Cymry or brethren; and

¹ P. 428, 'Cunedda was a Pict;' a little lower down, 'Cunedda was probably a Pict, and it is very doubtful whether the Picts of that date were Christians;' and at the foot of the page, 'it must be remembered that, though Celtic and Goidelic, and probably of the same race as the Welsh Goidels, yet the Cunedda family were both strangers and conquerors in Wales.' P. 429, 'It is assumed by Rhys that Cunedda was a Christian. . . . But beyond the fact that he was the great conqueror of South Wales, little is really known of him; there is plenty of legend; he is said to have been the son of Edern. But nothing is really known beyond the fact that he was the great founder of a line of saints.' P. 443, 'Cunedda being a Northern Pict, such Christianity as he possessed was derived from another source than that of Brychan.'

These passages are gathered together partly as an illustration of the somewhat tantalizing habit which Mr. Willis Bund has of repeating himself in a slightly different sense.

² 'Speaking broadly, this invasion of Cunedda and his sons was one of those tribal movements of which history is so full,' &c.—Seebohm, *Tribal System in Wales*, p. 142.

³ Skene, *Celtic Scotland*, i. 238; Rhys, *ut supra*.

that they, possibly pressed from behind by the Picts, had advanced into and gradually subdued greater part of Wales.

It may seem that the difference is comparatively unimportant, but as a matter of fact it is vital. Our whole view of subsequent Welsh history depends upon whether we think of Cunedda and his sons as a body of strangers in the midst of Wales, who gradually became assimilated with the natives, or whether we realize that it was they who really constituted the Welsh. The difference is vital; we may either regard them as displacing the Goidels of Wales, just as the English tribes did the Brythons (excepting that they admitted them far more freely to a servile tenure), or we may regard them as merely conquering them as the Normans did the English, and being gradually absorbed in them. They undoubtedly did the former; from this time onward the great invading host (helped perhaps by the fact that there were already some of allied race in Wales) gradually absorbed everything; the whole people rapidly became Cymric, and before very long the possession of Cymric blood was all-important.¹ Moreover, as this process went on the Brythons of the East were gradually driven backwards by the Saxon invader, and although many of them crossed the sea, no small proportion found a home amidst their comrades from the north. And so gradually their boundaries were contracted and themselves driven backward. The victory of Deorham in 577 made the West Saxons masters of the left bank of the Lower Severn, thus severing the people of Wales proper from those of West Wales or Cornwall. Some thirty-six years later, the capture of Chester by the Angles of Northumbria cut them off from their kindred of Cumbria—a far more serious blow. Thus, as their bard had predicted, their land they had lost, 'except Wild Wales.' But their very defeats and losses of territory resulted in concentration on the lands that were left them; and it is not fanciful to see in all this the completion of the process by which Wales was made.

It follows that the saints of Cunedda's race must not be regarded as foreigners, but as the very heart of the Welsh people. It follows that we must not regard the Welsh as a Goidelic people with an admixture of Irishmen and Picts, but as a people whose truly Brython stock is modified and enriched by admixture of Goidel, Irish, and possibly Pictish

¹ 'In the Welsh Codes the tribal system of Wales is made throughout to turn upon the possession of Cymric blood, and Cymru in the time of the Codes had become to a great extent geographically identical with modern Wales' (Seebohm, *op. cit.*, p. 140).

blood.
all ear
the W
Alban
Above
prepar
the G
laid a
charac
the Br
certain
broug
alread
missio
Thadi
York
Churc
any ra
order
to be
charac
overco
ciples
the vic
in the
the fa
pound
possib
featur
spread
but th
becam

But
althou
of his
of stu
our g
racter
when
'T

¹ N
from th
Roman
very ra
life the

blood. It follows that the Welsh have rightly taken hold of all early British history and claimed it as their own, and that the Welsh Church rightly looks back to the Church of St. Alban, of Restitutius, and of Fastidius, as one with itself. Above all it follows, *pace* Mr. Willis Bund, that we must be prepared to find that from the sixth century onward many of the Goidelic features of the earlier 'Welsh' Church are overlaid and absorbed in those which follow naturally from the character and structure of the Romano-British Church. For the Brythons—possibly those invading from the north,¹ and certainly those flying westwards before the English—naturally brought with them the ideas of Church life which, as we have already seen, they had so easily imbibed from the Latin missionaries. Consequently by the time that Bishops Thadioc and Theonus had been driven from their sees of York and London before the pressure of the invaders, the Church in Wales must already have been, to some extent at any rate, under the influence of those principles of Church order which they had been accustomed to live by. It seems to be Mr. Willis Bund's theory that the unadulterated Celtic characteristics continued in Wales until they were gradually overcome and subdued before the Latin ecclesiastical principles of the English Church. But we venture to say that the view above stated of the change which came over Wales in the fifth and sixth centuries really agrees far better with the facts of later Welsh Church life, as they are so ably expounded by himself, than Mr. Willis Bund's theory can possibly be made to do. It is true that the characteristic features of Celtic Christianity gradually died away before the spread of other principles of a more highly organized kind; but the great crisis had already taken place when Wales became the land of the Cymry.

But it is time to consider these features in detail, and although we are unable to follow Mr. Willis Bund in certain of his deductions, he has here applied the comparative method of study with most conspicuous success. Taking his work as our guide, then, let us see first what some of the more characteristic features were, and then how they became modified when Wales became Cymric.

'The Goidelic religion was philosophy *plus* idolatry. Here

¹ No doubt Brythonic Church life came mainly with the fugitives from the East. But if Cunedda had ever held even the semblance of a Roman authority in the north, whether at Carlisle or elsewhere, it is not very rash to conclude that there were at least some traces of Latin Church life there too.

the Christian could agree, if the idolatry was got rid of, to allow the philosophy to remain.' Accordingly a Goidelic Celt might become a Christian in name without really changing the basis of his life; by retaining his whole intellectual and moral environment and putting the name of the God of the Christians for that of his pagan gods. And, what was more, to the Goidelic Christian the missionary was after all no more than a new teacher, whom he regarded as being on much the same level as his old teachers. If he refused to hear him, there was an end of it; if otherwise, the new teacher was adopted by the tribe, largely as being more powerful or more knowing than other teachers, and therefore more useful in time of war or danger. This did not necessarily involve any definite act of renunciation of heathenism, for there was nothing very definite to renounce. There were no doubt very many who made no definite choice, who 'feared the Lord and served their own gods;' but in addition to these it is hard to resist the conclusion that for the bulk of the Goidels who became Christian the whole basis of their life remained pagan still.¹ In Mr. Willis Bund's expressive phrase, 'it was really paganism with a veneer of Christianity' (p. 17).

Side by side, for instance, with a most beautiful love for nature and realization of the presence of God in nature, the early Welsh Saints were addicted to pagan rites, and their curses would appear to have been both loud and deep.² It is clear that Celtic morals remained essentially pagan in character, and that this continued, not only until after the sixth century, but on into the middle ages. Drunkenness, a common vice amongst the English, was far more common amongst the Welsh, and was regarded, even amongst the clergy, as a venial matter which might be palliated by the demands of hospitality.³ Mr. Willis Bund's statement that the Celtic Church 'gloried in unchastity'⁴ can only be called

¹ Mr. Newell strongly dissents from this conclusion, and tries to show that there are only such survivals of paganism as are to be found in all other newly converted peoples (*op. cit.* 26 f., 65). But the facts are more than can be accounted for in this way; we have not to do with a mere survival of a few superstitious customs which are relics of paganism, such as those which are spoken of in the letters of St. Boniface to Pope Zachary, but with a Christian creed united with pagan life and thought, not unlike that which was adopted by Raedwald, king of East Anglia (Bede, *H. E.* lib. ii. cap. 15). See Rhys, *Hibbert Lectures*, *passim*.

² See especially the Life of St. Cadoc in the *Lives of Cambro-British Saints*.

³ See the Canons on the subject in Haddan and Stubbs, vol. i.

⁴ *Op. cit.* p. 160.

an extant models remain Welsh very d

'Mu based o called marriag Christian wild W the tent allusion Christian containi if it too in her n unquest Christian Record translati passages

And so thirteen North Wales, son of ane w daught

In c liarity it had the mos Cuned tribes, itself. C tribal li or, as i and his

¹ As already

² But passage interpol

³ *Cal VOL.*

an extravagant misrepresentation ; but, although most of the extant lives of Welsh Saints have been re-written on Latin models, and much that was unifying left out,¹ enough remains to make it clear that the morals of the age of the Welsh Saints (in which they themselves shared) were of a very debased character. Once more :

'Much of what appears to be the ancient law of Wales is not based on ideas that, in the widest possible interpretation, could be called Christian. For instance, the whole of the Welsh law of marriage and divorce could not have been framed by Christians for Christians. It may be said that it is something that among the wild Welsh tribes there was any law of marriage at all ; but that in the tenth century, a body of heathen customs with an occasional allusion to Christianity could be actually passed off as the law of a Christian people, could really have been approved by the Pope as containing nothing contrary to the law of God, is a wonderful instance, if it took place,² of what the Court of Rome would allow to be done in her name as long as her power was admitted and her authority unquestioned. It is not usually recognized that these so-called Christian Welsh laws . . . contain passages of such a nature, that the Record Commissioners, when publishing them with an English translation, felt obliged for the sake of decency to translate these passages not into English, but into Latin' (p. 26).

And so long-lived were these abuses that as late as the early thirteenth century Pope Honorius III. writes to Llywelyn of North Wales, blaming the detestable custom prevalent in Wales, that the son of the bondmaid should be heir with the son of the free wife, and permitting, nevertheless, in accordance with his desire, that David, his son by his wife the daughter of the English king, should succeed him.³

In other words, as Mr. Willis Bund says, 'the real peculiarity of the Celts was that they dealt with Christianity as if it had been any other tribal custom' (p. 49). The tribe was the most important Celtic institution ; and here the coming of Cunedda, whilst it may have altered the *personnel* of the tribes, only emphasized the importance of the institution itself. Consequently the development of Christianity followed tribal lines. Each tribe sooner or later accepted Christianity, or, as it probably seemed to many, adopted the missionary and his teaching into the tribe ; but to them this involved no

¹ As will be seen, *e.g.*, by comparing the ancient Life of St. Samson, already referred to, with the later Life in the *Liber Landavensis*.

² But it almost certainly did not. There is little doubt that the passage which says that the laws were approved at Rome is a late interpolation.

³ *Calendar of Papal Letters*, i. 87.

necessary connection of any kind between the religion of one tribe and that of another. It was to them a matter of no interest from what land a particular missionary had come ; if he succeeded he became a member of the tribe, and there, for practical purposes, was an end of the matter. Of anything like an organized Church life, or organized relations with one another, they can have had, at first, no idea whatever ; the Brythons from the east first brought them some idea of it, and then later on it was further developed, partly by imitation from England, partly by analogy of the growth of kingly powers amongst themselves. To speak or to think, then, of a Welsh province or dioceses or parishes, or of anything like an organized hierarchy, during the first two and a half centuries, is an anachronism. They had nothing of the kind, nor did they lack ; for the very idea was foreign to their whole genius and development.

The tribe, in Wales as elsewhere, was a society consisting of those who were, in theory at least, united by the bond of kindred ; and in Wales the bond of kindred was far closer and more real than amongst other Celtic peoples. Its members were bound together under the common head of their race ; but the idea of sharing in a common stock was never absent. The tribal idea 'was that the tribesman did not hold from anyone ; he became, as one of the tribe, entitled to a share in the tribal property' (p. 71). The tribe was, in fact, a compound person. But in Wales, as elsewhere, the main fact of tribal history 'is the relaxation of the rules of common descent and common property' (p. 74). And Christianity had its influence in each of these relaxations. By its teaching that all men were agnatic relations (since God 'hath made of one blood all men for to dwell on the face of the earth'), it proclaimed that all men were *capable* of admission into the tribe. And since this is done in the case of the Christian body by baptism, it followed that a man, already capable of tribal relationship, might be admitted to the tribe in the same way. Moreover, on the analogy of the lay tribe, there was gradually banded together a religious society which was known as the *tribe of the Saint*, a kind of artificial tribe not unlike those which seem to have been formed in some parts of India by imitation of the blood tribe.¹ Many questions with regard to this tribe of the Saint cannot be said to have been solved yet, even if they are soluble at all. We do not know, for example, whether it was possible

¹ Sir A. Lyell, *Asiatic Studies*, chap. vii., 'On the Formation of some Castes and Clans in India.'

for a
becam
wheth
Saint
clear t
Christ
to be
or serv
proper
degree
portan
who si
' mona
bably
societi
promin
than i
district
mission
only a
later c
stood

Th
were
the m
comm
took t
that o
necess
be 'fo
need n
its pro
the ch
We
first th
that th

¹ Monks
later mo
think th
Mawr w
mean m

² By
three gr
Achau y
plant Br

for a man to continue to belong to his old tribe when he became a member of the tribe of the Saint; nor is it clear whether the excommunication of a man from the tribe of the Saint carried with it civil consequences. But it would seem clear that the tribe of the Saint gradually grew up round the Christian teachers, its members consisting of those who desired to be more specially associated with them, whether as scholars or servants, and its basis being the possession of some special property segregated from that of the tribe at large. By degrees it acquired greater consistency, and became an important factor in civil life. At first only a society of those who shared a common lot, it gradually came to be of a more 'monastic' character according to the Latin models¹ (probably from actual copying). And in fact, at length these societies developed into the monasteries which were the most prominent institution of Welsh Christian life. By these, more than in any other way, the faith was spread in heathen districts; so that whilst the earliest teaching came from single missionaries who were adopted into the tribe itself, and were only able to effect anything at all by being so adopted, the later evangelical agency consisted of societies of men who stood as it were altogether apart from the tribe.

These monastic societies, however, as their origin shows, were clearly organized on the tribal basis; that is to say, the monks had an actual share in a common property and common life, presided over by their father the abbat, who took the place of the chief of the tribe. And his office, like that of a chief, was hereditary in his own family; it need not necessarily be given to the next in blood, but at least it must be 'founder's kin.' It would even appear that the abbat need not be in holy orders; and his relation to the monastery, its property, and its inmates was clearly analogous to that of the chief to the tribe.

We have here, in fact, the key to Welsh saintship. The first thing that strikes us about the Welsh Saints is the fact that there are very many of the same family,² and that whilst

¹ Mr. Willis Bund thinks that, unlike the Latin monks, 'the Celtic monks were mostly in orders:' but even if this be taken to apply to the later monasteries only, the statement is open to doubt. It is hard to think that the immense numbers of such monasteries as Bennchoir Mawr were all, or nearly all, in orders, even if we understand this to mean minor orders only.

² By far the greater number of them are said to have belonged to the three great families of Brychan, Cunedda, and Caw of Britain. See the *Achau y Saint Cymreig*, No. 68: 'Tair gwelygorth Sant ynys Brydain, plant Brychan, plant Cunedda Wledig, a plant Kaw o Brydain.'—*Cambro-*

in the three hundred years before 700 A.D. there are between four and five hundred saints, after this the list ceases entirely, with the exception of some four or five individuals, whose credentials are clearly of an altogether different kind. Now the explanation of this fact is to be found, as Mr. Willis Bund says,¹ in the peculiar meaning which the Welsh gave to the word *saint*. This, however, is only in accordance with the original meaning of the word (*sanctus*, *āyios*), which properly means, of course, not one who is good above other men (though this he ought to be), but one who is set apart. Thus 'Aaron the saint of the Lord' is consecrated to a special office and ministry. 'The saints which dwell at Corinth' are so called, not on account of their surpassing holiness, but because they have been chosen of God and set apart in Holy Baptism. In something the same way the Welsh saint was one who occupied some exceptional position by virtue of which he was a 'saint'; not necessarily as abbat, though this was the case with a very large number of them, but at any rate a member of an abbatial or some other special family. The credentials of saintship, in other words, were primarily external, not internal. "What saint art thou? and of what family art thou descended?" was the test question asked by St. Cadoc of the stranger who met him in Scotland.² And the Welsh Saints came to an end abruptly, soon after 700 A.D., probably because the entirely different criteria by which Ireland and England recognized people as saints caused the Welsh to give up their own peculiar custom.

From the original monastery, the mother church (*mam eglwys*) there were by degrees formed a number of branch establishments which one by one came to have an independent life, and ultimately gave rise to the parish churches of Wales. But only very slowly and gradually, and in varying degrees, did these branch establishments approximate to the pattern of the ecclesiastical parish as we find it growing

British Saints, p. 271. And so much stress is always laid upon the good birth (by no means necessarily the legitimate birth) of a saint as to make it clear that this was really one of the qualifications necessary for saintship. See Willis Bund, p. 426.

¹ He is hardly accurate, however, in saying (though the statement is modified later on) that 'the Latins claimed that the creation of saints was a privilege possessed by [the Pope], and by him alone' (p. 412). It is well known that most early saints were recognized as such, sometimes by the popular voice, sometimes by the local Church authorities, and sometimes by the civil power. The latter was the case with St. Dunstan, who was canonized by Cnut and his Witan.

² *Vita S. Cadoci*, c. 22 (*Cambro-British Saints*, p. 58); cf. Willis Bund, p. 426.

up el
stages
the v
'mon
direct
At an
celiba
been
to be

'E
granted
clearly
the W
their ri
four hu
. . . T
to last,
to mar

Th
But no
remain
Taxat
still m
such a

Fr
once th
in Wal
bute to
proper
'sheph
and th
clergy
minim
lute es
is to b
the Ep
were so

The
seem t
been so
of othe

¹ Mr
tical pur
Norman
² *Ibi*

up elsewhere in East and West alike. And here again the stages are by no means easy to trace. Probably, however, the very fact of the monasteries becoming more strictly 'monastic' resulted in a corresponding movement in the other direction of the clergy of the smaller *eglwys, capel, or bettwys*. At any rate, before very long there is, side by side with the celibate monks, a clergy with whom marriage seems to have been the rule rather than the exception. And this continued to be the case.

'Even up to the Reformation it seems that licences to marry were granted by the bishops to the Welsh clergy. . . . It thus seems to be clearly established that from the earliest times to the Reformation the Welsh clergy not only married, but succeeded in maintaining their right to marry, in spite of all the attempts of the Latins for over four hundred years, from 1115 to 1530, to force celibacy upon them. . . . The Welsh clergy are the only clerical body who have, from first to last, in spite of all opposition, asserted and maintained their right to marry' (p. 297).

This does not seem to us to be an exaggeration of the facts. But none the less, the marks of their monastic origin long remained in the Welsh secular churches.¹ In fact, when the *Taxatio* of Pope Nicholas was made in 1291, there were still many of their features which spoke clearly of this origin; such as divided (or rather joint) rectories and the like.²

From what is known as to the monasteries, it follows at once that the abbats were the principal ecclesiastical persons in Wales; although it would be an entire mistake to attribute to them anything of the nature of spiritual jurisdiction properly so called. This being so, and such 'oversight' and 'shepherding' as there was being in the hands of the abbats, and the possibility of communication between the Christian clergy in Wales and those elsewhere being reduced to a minimum; could there be a stronger testimony to the absolute essentialness which was attached to Holy Order than is to be found in the fact that, in spite of such difficulties, the Episcopal office and ordination by Laying on of Hands were so jealously preserved?

The position of the abbat being what it was, it would seem to follow that the position of the bishop must have been somewhat analogous to that of the 'monastic bishop' of other Celtic lands: a bishop, viz., who lived in a monastery

¹ Mr. Willis Bund says 'it is reasonable to suppose that, for ecclesiastical purposes, Wales was divided into parishes some time between the Norman Conquest and the beginning of the fourteenth century' (p. 345).

² *Ibid.* p. 41.

under the rule of the abbat, and ordained or confirmed as occasion arose. There is no real reason for doubting that this was the case. For the evidence, scattered as it is, is so widespread¹ as to make any other conclusion impossible; and this in spite of the great names which have been ranged on the other side—including those of the editors of the *Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents relating to Great Britain and Ireland*.² When we read of great numbers of bishops being consecrated by St. David, or present at a great synod in Wales, or taking part in the codifying of the Welsh laws, we can only come to the same conclusion with regard to Wales as we do with regard to Ireland when we read, in the earliest *Lives*, of St. Patrick consecrating 300 or 350 bishops,³ or are told by St. Bernard that in his day there were nearly as many bishops in Ireland as churches.⁴

But here again it appears to us that Mr. Willis Bund is misled because of his failure to realize the full meaning of the change which came over Wales and its Church life in the sixth century. Consequently he has to maintain, in the face of very strong evidence, that there were not diocesan bishops in Wales until long after this period: a thing which can only be done by explaining away much of it, and especially by minimizing the value of the *Liber Landavensis* and impugning quite unnecessarily the genuineness of its contents (p. 226 f.). But above all, the description which is given of Augustine's conferences with the British bishops (p. 246 f.) is distorted beyond words, in order to make it appear that the bishops there were subject to abbats. We can only suppose that it was written from memory, without an actual consultation of his authority. For Bede does not say that the Abbat of Bangor was present at the second conference, still less does he 'represent that abbat as taking a lead at the conference,' or as 'being regarded as the head of the Celtic Church.' The fact is that Mr. Willis Bund's theory seems to have run away with him here. No doubt there are signs of the Goidelic system of non-diocesan bishops still, but there are also clear signs that it is being supplanted by a diocesan system, and that the process of the 'Latinizing' of the Welsh Church is already in full force.

With that process we do not propose to deal here. It has

¹ It is well summarized by Newell, *op. cit.* pp. 58, 60.

² Vol. i. p. 142 f.

³ 'Documenta ex Libro Armachano,' in *Analecta Bollandiana*, vol. ii. p. 37 etc.

⁴ St. Bern. *De Vit. Malach.* c. 10.

been o
Church
pointin
Bund's
points.
instit
beyon
accura
Willis
a grea

ART.

1. *Tex*
(a)
Ja
G
N
M
2. *Die*
U
(V)
3. *The*
W
M
4. *The*
(I)

It is a
sacred
effectiv
ness, h
freedom
the wr
in par
Himse
literary
ences
them
have n
moral
skilled
Th

been our object to sketch the history of the early Welsh Church, and our work is done. We have not refrained from pointing out what we think the weak points of Mr. Willis Bund's book: but the book is far better than its weakest points. The reader will find in its pages a study of the institutions of ancient Welsh Christianity which is detailed beyond anything that has appeared before, and as a rule accurate; and by this thorough and often brilliant work Mr. Willis Bund has placed all students of Church history under a great obligation.

ART. VIII.—APOCRYPHAL APOCALYPSES AND THE APOCALYPSE OF ST. JOHN.

1. *Texts and Studies*: edited by J. ARMITAGE ROBINSON, D.D.
 (a) Vol. ii. No. 3, *Apocrypha Anecdota*: edited by M. R. JAMES, Litt.D. (b) Vol. iv. No. 2, *Coptic Apocryphal Gospels*: edited by FORBES ROBINSON, M.A. (c) Vol. v. No. 1, *Apocrypha Anecdota*, second series: edited by M. R. JAMES, Litt.D. (Cambridge, 1893-1897.)
2. *Die siebente Vision Daniels, armenischer Text mit deutscher Uebersetzung.* Von P. GREGORIS DR. KALEMKIAR. (Wien, 1892.)
3. *The Antichrist Legend.* Englished from the German of W. BOUSSET, with a Prologue on the Babylonian Dragon Myth, by A. H. KEANE. (London, 1896.)
4. *The Apocalypse of Baruch.* Edited by R. H. CHARLES, M.A. (London, 1896.)

It is a characteristic, as impressive as it is obvious, of the sacred writers of the New Testament that they delight in the effective literary employment of contrast. Light and darkness, heaven and hell, healing and judgment, bondage and freedom, and many another antithesis are as freely used by the writers of the Epistles as they were emphatically asserted, in parables and in direct dogmatic teaching, by our Lord Himself. This characteristic appears no less strikingly in the literary history of the first ages of the Church. The differences between the Holy Scriptures as the Church has received them and those writings, some of them long received, which have never found admission into the canon, may point a moral for the theologian or adorn a tale in the hands of the skilled writer of ecclesiastical history.

The literary activity which has been expended with such

splendid results during the last ten years on the history of the Early Church has been in nothing more remarkably illuminative than in the publication of a great mass of early 'Apocrypha.' For this, while we do not forget the labours of German scholars, we must express a very special debt of gratitude to the Cambridge workers for Professor Armitage Robinson's *Texts and Studies*, and above all to that most accomplished and learned man of letters, Dr. Montague Rhodes James. The field which is covered by the work of these scholars is so vast that we cannot in a single article at all adequately survey it. We propose, therefore, rather to direct attention to some features of the strange writings which have now been made public, which seem to us of singular interest in themselves and to illustrate in a remarkable way the unique position of the Holy Scriptures in the mass of early Christian literature.

A turning point in a book which filled a large, perhaps too large, space in theological discussion a few years ago is found where the Christian convictions of the chief character are disastrously affected by a celebrated German book, which, assigning a late date to the Book of Daniel, declares that it 'created a new Apocalyptic literature.' It was argued that the influence of this literature would be profound, and that it would prove a leading factor in the genesis of Christianity and in the mental development of its Founder.

So rapidly do popular books now become out of date that perhaps *Robert Elsmere* is already in danger of being forgotten. At any rate a very small knowledge of the history and the contents of the literature in question should serve to discredit this hypothesis. Even M. Renan treated the Apocalyptic literature of the Jewish Church more critically and more successfully.

'La forme¹ d' "apocalypse" adoptée par l'auteur [of the Revelation of St. John] n'était pas neuve en Israël. Ezéchiel avait déjà inauguré un changement considérable dans le vieux style prophétique, et on peut en un sens le regarder comme le créateur du genre apocalyptique. A l'ardente prédication, accompagnée parfois d'actes allégoriques extrêmement simples, il avait substitué, sans doute sous l'influence de l'art assyrien, la vision, c'est-à-dire un symbolisme compliqué où l'idée abstraite était rendue au moyen d'êtres chimériques, conçus en dehors de toute réalité.² Zacharie continua de marcher dans la même voie.'

¹ *L'Antichrist*, pp. 357 sqq. We quote without endorsing all the statements of the text.

² The latter part of this sentence will scarcely commend itself to sober students.

T
seen
occas
apoca
the G
In
the de
peopl
result
cultie
we m
natur
dange
and th
outbu
Br
no rea
a mu
the C
of Ch
would
at all
centu
book
it in
surrou
ductio
We a
Unqu
form
afford
sides
such a
Story
Apoc
the A
Vision
what
and in
of the
plete.
exten

¹ A
publish
vol. v.

Taking this view, the series of Apocalyptic writings is seen to be continuous, and to have been developed from occasional passages in prophetic writings till books definitely apocalyptic become common, and the era of *Apokalyptik*, as the German writers term it, begins.

In this view Daniel is seen only to have marked a stage in the development. And it is to be observed that the Jewish people, at great crises of their fate, embodied in visions the results of their spiritual strivings with the terrors and difficulties that beset them. Apocalyptic writings, then, are (if we may use the term of a literature so charged with supernatural imagery) a natural result of times of distress and danger. The persecution of Antiochus, the reign of Herod, and the reigns of Nero, Domitian, Hadrian, are marked by outbursts of more or less inspired vision.

But, to restrict ourselves to a more limited field, there is no reason to deny the peculiar interest, or the influence, of a much more limited kind, of the Apocalyptic literature of the Christian era. There is no question here of the Mind of Christ being directed to the pursuit of visionary ideals: it would not even be asserted that the theology of the Church was at all markedly influenced by the visions of the first Christian centuries. But when we find one avowedly Apocalyptic book in the Canon it can hardly be unprofitable to think of it in relation to the Christian literature which, as it were, surrounds it. To this, owing to recent discoveries and reproductions, attention has of late years been especially directed.¹ We are astonished at the mass of literature of the kind. Unquestionably we do not possess it all, even in a fragmentary form; but what we do possess, remarkable in its variety, affords at least a sample of a much larger collection. Besides works standing on the verge, as it were, of the subject—such as the *Shepherd* of Hermas or in another direction the *Story of Zosimus*—we have the Apocalypse of St. John, the Apocalypse of Paul, the Apocalypse of the Blessed Virgin, the Apocalypse of Peter, the Apocalypse of Sedrach, the Vision of Saturus, the History of Barlaam and Josaphat, and what is called the Testament of the Lord—with certain curious and interesting fragments. Even this list, containing works of the most diverse character and different date, is not complete. And we may place the Book of Enoch to some extent in a category by itself.

¹ An extremely interesting list, of the nature of a calendar, of recently published Apocryphal writings is given by Dr. James, *Texts and Studies*, vol. v. no. 1, pp. 154-68.

Mr. Charles's admirable edition¹ of this remarkable book, we may remark in passing, has directed attention to the interrelations of the Jewish and Christian literatures in the early ages of the Church. Much may be learned from the widespread influence of this exceptional contribution to Apocalyptic literature. Through Mr. Charles's labours we have already learned a great deal, and we may expect to learn more when his labours and those of our greatest Slavonic scholar, Mr. Morfill, whose knowledge may be spoken of without exaggeration as encyclopædic, are completed.

The Book of Enoch, though it is unquestionably affected here and there by Greek influence, is especially of importance as a work of Palestinian origin and Palestinian tone. We have spoken above chiefly of the Christian apocalyptic literature, but Mr. Charles's work reminds us that it must not be forgotten—and it has already been mentioned—that the Jewish apocalyptic literature, both before and after the Christian era, was considerable. In this the doctrine of the Messiah as it was developed among Jewish thinkers by the aid of 'vision' and 'revelation'—apart from the inspired writings of the Canonical Scriptures—may be studied. The Apocalypse of Moses, the Apocalypse of Isaiah, the Fourth Book of Esdras, the Apocalypse of Baruch—and perhaps the Apocalypse of Abraham and the Apocalypse of Adam—fall within this category. Apocalyptic literature was, in a sense, the culmination of the prophetic school. The object of Apocalyptic literature is a necessary complement to the work of the prophetic writers. The righteousness of God, the sufferings of the just on earth, these were the facts with which the religious teachers of the immediately pre-Christian Age had to deal, and these were the problems which still embarrassed the Jewish writers who turned away from Jesus the Messiah. Thus it was, says Mr. Charles, that the apocalyptic writers came to present 'a Semitic philosophy of religion.' How profoundly this philosophy came to be affected by Christian influences is seen in the beautiful 'Apocalypse of Baruch.' In the different redactions of this book we have a curious example of the difficulties in which the constructors of such a philosophy found themselves involved, and of the necessity of resort to Christian sources for the purpose of dealing adequately with the problems of existence. Thus, again, while the Apoca-

¹ *The Book of Enoch*. Translated from Professor Dillmann's Ethiopic Text, emended and revised in accordance with hitherto uncollated Ethiopic MSS. and with the Gizeh and other Greek and Latin Fragments. Edited by R. H. Charles, M.A. (Clarendon Press, 1893.)

lypse of
Esdras
and, so
phecy is
to Chris

In t
itself is
accept t

'L'A
mot d'Is
par exem
grandes
temps e
hommes

So n
the adm
of Har
of the
Vischer
would
ment c
in the t
imposs

'Th
The mo
not real
strange
historia
same w
many o

Thus
other
Ramsa
To
admitt

¹ An
dealt w
connexi
the Div

² Jo
³ L
⁴ Th
Sanda
⁵ Sa
⁶ CH

lypse of Baruch remains purely Judaic, the Fourth Book of Esdras has fallen admittedly under strong Christian influence, and, so to speak, confesses 'the failure of Judaism.'¹ Prophecy is followed by apocalypse, and apocalypse must resort to Christian teaching.

In this sense it is true that the Apocalypse of St. John itself is the climax of Jewish prophecy. And so far we may accept the statement of M. Renan—

'L'Apocalypse est, en un sens, le sceau de la prophétie, le dernier mot d'Israël. Qu'on lise dans les anciens prophètes, dans Joël,² par exemple, la description du "jour de Jéhovah," c'est-à-dire de ces grandes assises que le justicier suprême des choses humaines tient de temps en temps, pour ramener l'ordre sans cesse troublé par les hommes, on y trouvera le germe de la vision de Patmos.'³

So much may, with some reservation, be admitted, without the admission carrying with it any concession to the theories of Harnack and Vischer with regard to the composite origin of the Revelation of St. John.⁴ The elaborate argument of Vischer is based chiefly upon an analysis of the book which would sunder the Christian elements from their Old Testament connexion, and upon a collection of the many references in the text to the Old Testament prophets. But it is really impossible to make a satisfactory division.

'The supposed dualism of the Apocalypse has an artificial look. The more it is examined the more it is felt that the Apocalypse will not really bear to be dismembered. The very peculiar style with its strange eccentricities of grammar runs through the whole; the historical situation implied in the parts supposed to be added is the same with that in those supposed to be original; and there are many other cross-references from the one to the other.'⁵

Thus Professor Sanday admirably sums up the arguments, other than the purely historical ones given by Professor Ramsay⁶ on this point.

To pass from the particular to the general, it will be admitted that it is difficult to sharply divide Christian from

¹ Another interesting subject opened by the Book of Baruch and not dealt with completely by Mr. Charles in his admirable edition is its connexion with the Apocalypse of Peter, and thus, it may be added, with the *Divina Commedia*.

² Joel ii. 1 sqq.

³ *L'Antichrist*, pp. 462-3.

⁴ The most recent criticism of these, a brief one, is that by Professor Sanday, *Bampton Lectures*, pp. 370 sqq.

⁵ Sanday, *Bampton Lectures*, pp. 371-2.

⁶ *Church in the Roman Empire*, pp. 268, 301.

Jewish apocalyptic writings; but this admission has little more significance than has an acknowledgment that classical legend coloured certain aspects of the 'apocryphal' conceptions of a future life.

However this may be, it is quite clear that the judgment of the Church could not long be doubtful in regard to these works, when the canon of Holy Scripture came to be fixed.

In Jewish and Christian literature two books stand quite apart from the rest—the one of the old Revelation, the other of the new. Each is indescribably loftier and more spiritual than the other writings, which are in different degrees akin. It may be difficult to define what inspiration is; but few readers, in making a distinction, would hesitate to say that the Book of Daniel and the Apocalypse of St. John were 'inspired,' and that the rest of the literature was not.¹

Confining ourselves, then, to the literature connected with the Christian dispensation, we may say that the Apocalypse of St. John is the centre of a great mass of 'visionary' writing. All the smaller and poorer writings have a connexion, however slight, with the great Revelation of Patmos. Not only is this the case, but it may be further observed that two of its leading ideas profoundly influenced the later writings, and that often with a remarkable similarity in the details of expression. Or, to put the statement in another form, two dominant conceptions are found in nearly all the Apocalyptic literature of the Early Christian period. Not two only, but two especially. These two are placed in marked contrast. They are Christ and Antichrist.

The contrast appears to be not the contrast between God the Son and the Devil,² but between a human monster of wickedness and Jesus in the sanctity of His Human Life. The ἀντίχριστος may be distinguished from the ψευδόχριστος,³ the former being one who actively opposes Christ, assuming on occasion His office and His functions, the latter being merely a pretender to the Messianic position. The cardinal feature of the contrast is expressed with vivid insight by Dr. Westcott. While 'the work of the Incarnation was to reveal the true Divine destiny of man in his union with God

¹ We do not forget the mention of the Apocalypse of Peter in the Muratorian Fragment, or Dr. M. R. James's discussion of Dr. Zahn's contention on the subject. The plain meaning of the passage is in favour of the distinction. 'All admit the Apocalypse of John, some will not allow that of Peter to be read.'

² But see Westcott, *Epistles of St. John*, p. 87.

³ See Westcott, *ibid.* p. 69, note.

through Christ, . . . the lie of Antichrist was to teach that man is divine apart from God in Christ.'

How did these two contrasted conceptions arise? The 'Legend of Antichrist' has been treated with abundance of learning, and with no inconsiderable perversity, by Dr. Wilhelm Bousset, of Göttingen. His interesting book has been translated by Mr. A. H. Keane, who has contributed a preface, in which he has traced, with what success we leave his readers to estimate for themselves, the Antichrist legend to an 'anthropomorphic transformation of the Babylonian dragon myth,' which is 'doubtless one of the earliest evolved by primitive man.'

The views expounded by Dr. Bousset and Mr. Keane are probably of greater interest to the anthropologist than they are to the theologian. For ourselves we are not, certainly at present, concerned to trace, with Gunkel, 'the after-effects of the old Babylonian dragon myth in its last echoes in the New Testament.' Our object is rather very briefly to disentangle the characteristic features of the two conceptions of Christ and Antichrist as they are presented in Apocalyptic literature. We cannot do this exhaustively. We shall have accomplished our aim when we have called attention to a few salient features.

And first the conception of Antichrist. This may be considered to start from the declaration of our Lord Himself (in St. Matthew xxiv. 11 and corresponding passages) concerning the *ψευδοπροφήται*. (The 'false prophet' is not the same as the 'false Christ'; and the distinction already referred to between 'false Christ' and 'antichrist' can be better traced in writings later in original conception than the Gospels.) From this it starts, and from the more definite prophecy of St. Paul (2 Thessalonians ii. 3), and it is brought forward still more distinctly in St. John's First Epistle. *Παῖδια, ἐσχάτη ὥρα ἐστὶ, καὶ καθὼς ἠκούσατε ὅτι Ἀντίχριστος ἔρχεται, καὶ νῦν ἀντίχριστοι πολλοὶ γεγόνασιν* (ii. 18; and again ii. 22, iv. 3, and 2 St. John 7). All these references are combined by St. Irenæus in his detailed treatment of the subject. The references in the Early Fathers to these passages are discussed by Dr. Westcott, and there is no need to refer to them here. It is clear that the Church early formed a more or less definite conception of a character and a person to whom the name of Antichrist was given. It may, however, be said that there is no reference here to the Apocalypse. Is, then, the idea of St. Paul and of St. John's Epistles to be found also in the Revelation?

It is true that the Beast of the Apocalypse is nowhere directly named as Antichrist; but the description leaves little room for doubt that the conception is fundamentally the same.

The Beast is worshipped by the whole earth; he has great power and authority; his mouth is opened in blasphemy against God and the Name; he overcomes the Saints in war; and his mark is laid on those who worship him, on 'all that dwell on the earth, everyone whose name hath not been written in the Book of Life of the Lamb.' The conception of Antichrist and of the Beast is fundamentally the same. It is that of a great world-power, represented from time to time in a person, or personified in continued existence, and opposed to Christ, His Worship, His Religion, His People.

There is a curious instance, it may be remarked parenthetically, of exact identification of the Beast with Antichrist (if Dr. M. R. James's plausible suggestion be accepted¹) in the 'Description of Antichrist,' which has been considered to be connected with the 'Apocalypse of Peter,'² 'DLXIVC erit nomen Antichristi'—i.e. the Antichrist is 666, the 'number of the Beast.' It may be noted also that some of the Apocalypses retain the expression 'false prophet' (as in the Gospels and the Apocalypse of St. John)—so the Apocalypse of Peter i.—while others adopt the title Antichrist. Speaking generally, it may be said that the further the writings appear to be removed in date from the Apostolic time the more detailed and personal is the description. Thus the 'Apocalypse of Zephaniah,' which existed in the second century, is full of direct reference to the canonical writings.

'The son of wickedness will appear and say, "I am the Christ," although he is not. Believe ye not on him . . . [he] will stand once more upon the holy place: he will say to the sun: "Be eclipsed!" and it will be so: he will say "Shine!" and it will obey him: he will say: "Be darkened," and it will be darkened. He will say to the moon: "Be thou turned into blood," and it will be so: he will make it vanish from the heaven. He will walk upon the sea and the rivers as upon the dry land: he will cause the lame to walk, the deaf to hear, the dumb to speak, and the blind to see: he will cleanse the lepers, heal the sick, cast devils out of them that are possessed, and will

¹ *Apoc. Anecdota* (*Texts and Studies*, ii. 3), p. 118. On the words 'Dexius erit nomen Antichristi': 'Two explanations of this occur here: the first is to read 'Decius' and so get a date either for the composition, or more probably for the excerpt from a complete book, of this fragment: the second is to transform 'Decius' into Roman numerals, D. L. X. I. V. C., which gives us the familiar number 666.'

² *Apoc. Anecd.* p. 151 sqq.; *Apoc. of Peter*, pp. 53-8.

multiple things

THE
Antic
Apoc
the L
are f
Script
which
the c
Jewis
of Jos

'A
They
ing J
Where
lived t
my h
death,
escape
as the
shouti
kill the
of wat
him.

'X
who a
of per
and o

T
of th
It oc
does
Kalen
says
smoo
head
and s
collec
and t

'2
'The
those
them
Henoc

² L

multiply his signs and wonders before all the world. He will do the things that the Christ will do, save only the raising of the dead.'

The description then given of the personal appearance of Antichrist is much vaguer than that of later works. The Apocalyptic fragment known in Syriac as the Testament of the Lord, the Apocalypses of Esdras and of John (Apocryphal), are fuller and more personal in description and less Scriptural in reference. Two quotations we may here give which have an interest of their own. The first, which brings the conception of Antichrist into special relation to the Jewish saints, occurs in the Bohairic Account of the Death of Joseph. It runs as follows:—

'And again ye have told me concerning Enoch and Elias, saying, They are living in the flesh wherein they were born. But concerning Joseph also, my father according to the flesh, ye have asked, Wherefore hast Thou not left him in the flesh until now? If he had lived ten thousand years, yet must he needs die. I say unto you, O my holy members, that every time Enoch and Elias remember death, they would willingly have died already, that they might escape this great necessity which is laid down for them: especially as these men will die in a day of confusion and of fear and of shouting and of threatening and of grief. For the antichrist shall kill these two men, and shed their blood upon the earth for a pot of water because of the rebukes which they shall give him, reproving him.

'XXXII. We answered and said to Him, Our Lord and our God, who are these two men concerning whom Thou hast said, The son of perdition shall kill them for a pot of water? Our Saviour Jesus and our Life said to us, They are Enoch and Elias.'¹

The second is noteworthy for the details of its description of the physical and intellectual characteristics of Antichrist. It occurs in the Armenian Seventh Vision of Daniel, and does not appear to be very closely rendered by Father Kalemkiar in his German version.² 'The joints of his knees,' says the writer, 'are unbendable, [he is] maimed of the eyes, smooth-browed (or, with no eyebrows), *sickle-fingered*, sword-headed, graceful, magniloquent, wise, with a pleasant laugh,' and so on. The description may be compared with those collected by Dr. James in the *Apocrypha Anecdota* (i. 155), and the phrase 'sword-headed' (possibly long-headed, quick-

¹ *Texts and Studies*, vol. iv. pt. ii. pp. 146-7. See footnote, p. 229: 'The Arabic here has no allusion to water. It runs thus: "Who are those four, those of whom Thou hast said that the Antichrist shall slay them because of their reproaching? The Saviour answered, They are Henoch, Elias, Schila and Tabitha."

² *Die siebente Vision Daniels*, p. 41.

witted) stands side by side with that there given, αἱ τρίχες τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτοῦ ὀξῶται ὡς βέλη.¹

From this brief statement it will be seen that, though the fundamental conception is the same, there is considerable variety in the detailed working out. And this variety makes it exceedingly improbable that Antichrist is Nero alone.² That Antichrist in Armenian is *Neren* is an interesting fact, but it cannot be said to be enough to support an argument in general so one-sided.

The great central conception of Antichrist, which enters so largely into early Christian literature, is in its nature manifold.

Secondly, we have the conception and the description of Christ Himself. Here the chief original is undoubtedly Daniel vii. 9 and 13—

‘And I beheld till the thrones were cast down, and the Ancient of Days did sit, Whose garment was white as snow, and the hair of His Head like the pure wool : His throne was like the fiery flame, and His wheels as burning fire. . . . One like the Son of Man [Who] came with the clouds of Heaven, and came to the Ancient of Days, and they brought Him near before Him.’³

This is reproduced in Revelation i. 13 *sqq.*, and copied, amplified, altered by other writers :

‘One like unto the⁴ Son of Man, clothed with a garment down to the foot, and girt about the breasts with a golden girdle. And His head and His hair were white as white wool, as snow ; and His eyes were as a flame of fire ; and His feet like unto burnished brass, as if it had been refined in a furnace ; and His voice as the voice of many waters. And He had in His right hand seven stars ; and out of His mouth proceeded a sharp two-edged sword : and His countenance was as the sun shineth in his strength.’

There is a curious similarity (to quote one instance) in the Book of Enoch—in the description of the birth of Enoch. ‘Cui oculi sunt sicut radii solis, capilli autem ejus candiores in septies nive’ is the reading of the Latin version. The English rendering of the Ethiopic runs thus :

‘His body was white as snow and red as the bloom of a rose,

¹ The writer's attention has been called to this by Professor Armitage Robinson, to whose kindness he is greatly indebted.

² See Renan, *L'Antichrist*, p. 476 *sqq.*, where the argument is made little less than ridiculous by the assertion that the book marks a violent opposition to St. Paul, and that the ‘disciples of Paul are the disciples of Balaam and Jezabel.’ On Nero's relations towards the Christians, see *Le Christianisme et l'Empire Romain*, by Paul Allard (1897), pp. 14–17.

³ On the title ‘the Son of Man’ see especially Mr. Charles's acute Appendix B, *Book of Enoch*, pp. 312–7.

⁴ Surely this is to be preferred to R.V. rendering, ‘a Son of Man.’

and the
and who
like the

Thus t
type.
just m
(ii. and
looked
of the
their b
rose .
So in
makes

It r
Apocal
any wa
as full
undoub
of the
time t
embod
in alm
Apocry
founda
beliefs.
whole
Peter t
may be
and th
centuri
the wh
way, th

The
the gre
—Chri
differen
severe
ticulari
descrip
passed
weapon
like all

¹ So
Dante
Guardia
VOL.

and the hair of His head was white as wool, and His eyes beautiful; and when He opened His eyes they illuminated the whole house like the sun.¹

Thus the description of the 'antitype' is transferred to the type. It is transferred also to the angels, and to the spirits of just men made perfect. Thus in the Apocalypse of Peter (ii. and iii.) the angels, coming from the East, could not be looked upon, 'for there came from their countenance a ray as of the sun . . . and when we saw them we were amazed: for their bodies were whiter than any snow, and redder than any rose . . . and their hair was thick and curling and bright.' So in the Vision of Zosimus the brightness of the angel makes the seer fear that he is the Son of God.

It may be taken as a distinguishing characteristic of the Apocalyptic literature that the Lord, and all those who in any way share in the glory reflected from Him, are depicted as full of light, as shining, illuminating, bright. This comes undoubtedly from a fanciful amplification of the titles 'Light of the World,' 'Sun of Righteousness,' and it is at the same time the familiar antithesis between light and darkness, embodied in Christian literature and enforced and developed in almost every conceivable aspect. In this connexion the Apocryphal literature is of the highest importance as the foundation of countless legends and still surviving popular beliefs. Here strong reason has been shown for starting a whole succession of detailed visions from the Apocalypse of Peter through the Apocalypse of Paul. The whole literature may be regarded thus as an offshoot from the Book of Daniel and the Revelation of St. John, and as leading up through centuries of puerile futilities to an Apocalypse which surpasses the whole apocryphal literature of the subject in every possible way, the *Divina Commedia* of Dante.¹

Thus it would seem that the two great ideas which form the great contrast present to the mind of the Apostolic Age—Christ and the 'Man of Sin'—underwent development on different lines. The thought of Antichrist, when it lost the severe restraint of the Apostolic writers, became more particularized and embodied from time to time in personal description, to suit the exigencies of the moment. Thence it passed into the hands of mediæval writers and became a weapon of controversy, which was found at the Reformation, like all such weapons, to be two-edged.

¹ Some of the similarities between the Apocalypse of Peter and Dante have been already drawn out in an article published in the *Guardian* newspaper.

The conception of the glorified Jesus, on the other hand, was treated with a certain reverence. The sanctified wisdom of the Evangelists preserved Him, to a considerable degree, from the defiling touch of the visionary and the romancer. But the characteristics attributed to His glorified personality were reflected from It to all in any way connected with Him, and from the ideas of St. John were developed the marvellous conceptions of Paradise and Heaven, of which the medieval period was so prolific, and which still so powerfully influence popular conceptions of the future life. It is not asserted, of course, that the contrast of light and darkness, of which the later Christian Apocalyptic literature is full, is derived solely from the New Testament imagery, or that the pictures of Heaven and Hell were always based upon the solemn statements of the Canonical books. There is, for instance, a remarkable similarity between the descriptions in the Apocalypse of Peter—as well as in the vision of Josaphat and Saturus and other apocalyptic writings—and the famous passage in the tenth book of Plato's *Republic*, the 'vision of Er.' It would rather be said that the severe and awful restraint of the words of the Divine Master and Judge is forgotten by the fanciful writers whose imagination ran riot in the thought of a future life. The reiterated emphasis on the idea of light, on the other hand, is common to almost every religious system. But it receives unquestionably an increased force as it passes through the medium of the inspired writings of the Old and New Testaments. Our Lord shall destroy the wicked with the brightness of His coming, says St. Paul; for sinners are, as Job says, 'those that rebel against the light; they know not the ways thereof, neither abide in the paths thereof.' The idea, present throughout Biblical literature, receives its consummation in the last book of the Canonical Scriptures. The Apocalypse of St. John marks the highest point of the spiritual treatment of the contrast, which continues, weakened and made fanciful, to be the theme of later writers, no less prominent in the fourteenth than in the second century.

ART

1. *The*
E
ar
2. *De*
su
W
R
T

IN the
with a
Exposi
speaks
promin
(p. vi).
of the
plicity
special

We
suppos
failing
the Eas
logians
human
practic
to keep
works
Roman
popula
If, und
through
English
was pa
outcom
Church
and life
one wh
their su
'the gre
but for

ART. IX.—THE SACRED MANHOOD OF THE SON OF GOD.

1. *The Incarnation. A Study of Philippians ii. 5-11.* By E. H. GIFFORD, D.D., formerly Archdeacon of London and Canon of St. Paul's. (London, 1897.)
2. *De Incarnatione Verbi Dei, together with three Essays subsidiary to the same.* By the Rev. ALAN S. HAWKES-WORTH. With a Commendatory Preface by the Very Rev. E. A. HOFFMAN, S.T.D., LL.D., Dean of the Gen. Theo. Sem. (Albany, N.Y., 1897.)

IN the preface to the volume in which he has re-published, with additional matter, two articles which appeared in the *Expositor* for September and October 1896, Dr. Gifford speaks of the 'tendency in modern thought to give especial prominence to the earthly life and human character of Christ' (p. vi). And no doubt it is the case that the human aspects of the incarnate life of our Lord have of late through a multiplicity of widely differing causes been the object of very special attention from many Christians.

We do not at all agree with those writers who seem to suppose that to minimize the Humanity of Christ has been a failing in historical Christianity. Certainly the great Fathers of the East and the West and the representative scholastic theologians had the very strongest sense of the reality of the human nature and actions of the Divine Saviour. The practical methods of mediæval Western religion were at pains to keep before the minds of the children of the Church the works and sufferings of our Lord in His Manhood. Modern Roman Catholicism, alike in its technical theology and in its popular teaching, is careful to lay stress on His Humanity. If, under the influence of a particular school of thought and through the existence of much general laxity, the hold of English religion on the Gospels was for a time loosened, it was part of the work of the great Tractarian leaders and an outcome of their loyalty to the traditions of the Universal Church that they recalled to men's minds the human example and life of Christ. Under their influence, as has been said by one who had every opportunity of estimating their aims and their success,

'the great Name stood no longer for an abstract symbol of doctrine, but for a living Master, who could teach as well as save.'¹

¹ Church, *The Oxford Movement*, p. 168.

For what the Tractarians thus did we may well be profoundly grateful, while some share in our gratitude is due to those many students, critics, archæologists, whose patient study of the Gospels has enabled us to realize more exactly the detailed words and actions of our Lord's human life.

The reality and completeness of the Sacred Manhood of the Son of God are not only part of the traditional Christian faith; they are necessary to all which He did upon earth or now does in Heaven. The appeals which He makes to human hearts are those of One who is Himself perfectly Man. The authority with which He commands is exercised in complete experiential knowledge of human nature. His sympathy has the power which comes from actual passing through the needs and trials of men. His example is a human example. The value of His Atonement depends in part on his possession of human body and mind and spirit and of a human experience. His Sacraments would lose much of their meaning if His Nature were not completely the same as ours; while, to pass on in thought to the future, His office as Judge has a special significance because of the perfection of His Manhood. And, in Dr. Gifford's words:

'we cannot but sympathize with the effort to pourtray the "Perfect Man" in all the reality of our human nature, as helping to produce a livelier sense of the sympathy, compassion, and self-sacrificing love of Him who could "be touched with the feeling of our infirmities," and "tempted in all points like as we are, yet without sin"' (Preface, p. vii).

Yet, while we thus are grateful to all which gives prominence to the human aspects of the Incarnate life, there is need of caution lest, in the necessary imperfections of our minds, this prominence may tend to obscure the vital truth upon which the Tractarians had a co-ordinate grasp, the true Godhead of Him Who is Man. And, accordingly, we find Dr. Gifford going on to say:

'there is cause for fear lest humanitarian views of our Saviour's life on earth, if regarded too exclusively and pressed too far, may tend, in minds less learned and less devout, to obscure that glory of the Incarnate Word, which was beheld by the Apostles, "a glory as of the only-begotten of the Father"' (Preface, p. vii).

The peculiar significance of our Lord's Manhood depends upon the fact that He is also God. Moreover the value of it is to a large extent connected with His possession of the Divine attributes of His eternal life at the time of the Ministry. And it is in this respect that there is a danger,

about various
gaining
indeed
sions v
the ess
when i
nation
or thos
up in c
the un
our Lo
portan
with t
deman

The
special
If, at
Gospel
God, H
those c
cease t
all oth
who is
life He
a multi
because
through
of circ
cumsta
force o
life oug
and wo
possess
of God
picture
the ver

'Th
least th
in the o
thus Hi
of lovin
of God's

'If,
the form

about which sufficient has not perhaps as yet been said, in the various forms of the 'kenotic theories' which appear to be gaining a footing in the Church of England. There are, indeed, other dangers about which we have on various occasions written at some length. The Deity of the Word and the essential immutability of the Divine Nature are endangered when it is asserted that the Son of God parted in the Incarnation with certain Divine attributes, whether those of power or those of goodness. Some positions which have been taken up in close connexion with 'kenoticism' imperil the truth of the union of the Divine Nature and the Human Nature of our Lord in one Person. It is a further point of great importance that such views as we have in mind are incompatible with the Manhood of Christ being what Christian thought demands that it should be.

The appeal and the authority of Christ as Man have their special significance because, as He speaks, He is true God. If, at the moment when He uttered the words which the Gospels record, He was not in possession of the attributes of God, His sayings might indeed be regarded as on a level with those of a great prophet or an inspired Apostle; they would cease to be the human utterances which have a value beyond all other human utterances because they were spoken by one who is personally God. So also with His sympathy. In one life He gained the possession of experiential sympathy with a multitude of other lives of the most varying circumstances, because the Divine attributes which were His as He passed through His earthly life enabled Him to find in a single set of circumstances contact with and experience of other circumstances, of which these were but typical. It is part of the force of His example, again, that He is showing what human life ought to be by revealing the life of God in human action and words. If He did not, at the time of this manifestation, possess in all their fulness His attributes as the eternal Son of God, He might be exhibiting, as a saint might exhibit, a picture of great value; He would not be actually revealing the very life of God. As Dr. Gifford powerfully says:

'The continuance in Christ of the *form of God* assures us that at least the moral attributes of the Godhead are faithfully represented in the one perfect image of the Father, His Incarnate Word. And thus His every act of tender compassion, of patient endurance, and of loving self-sacrifice shines out in its perfect beauty as a revelation of God's own nature, and of His gracious disposition towards us.

'If, on the other hand, the *form of God* is laid aside in *taking the form of a servant*, and the influence of the Divine nature thus

suppressed, as in kenotic theories, the life of Christ on earth may still serve for our example, by showing what *man* may possibly attain when endued with the fulness of grace and power by the Holy Spirit ; but by ceasing to be a direct revelation of the character of God it loses the power "to clothe eternal love with breathing life" (pp. 101-2).

We go further. The central act of our Lord in the days of His humiliation requires His complete possession of all that is Divine. The Atonement has its value because the Sacrifice is that of One who is not only representative of the human race, but is also truly God, and therefore able as God to plead with the Father and give efficacy beyond that of any human power and goodness to His life and sufferings and death. And it is not only the more extreme 'kenotic' theories which imperil the meaning and power of the work of the human Christ on the Cross. The less extreme forms which are more common in the Church of England are fraught with danger. It is part of what He has done that the Father has 'laid on Him the iniquity of us all,'¹ and that He willingly accepted the burden and consciously offered sacrifice for the human race. If on becoming Incarnate He laid aside His divine knowledge, and had not resumed it when He died upon the Cross, how can we suppose that He was, as an intelligent Victim, atoning for the whole human race? If in the upper room He had no Divine knowledge, what becomes of the inner meaning of His human self-oblation there? If when, still in the state of humiliation, He descended into the unseen world He was without Divine knowledge, how can we retain belief in the specific value of His work among the souls to whom then he preached?

We do not doubt, as we have repeatedly said, that some recent writers in the Church of England who have asserted one or another form of the 'kenosis' have done so with the best intentions. So far as their action has been directly connected with the Incarnation at all, and has not been an outcome of an attitude taken up towards certain critical theories which have been supposed to have made good their ground, there has been the desire to maintain the reality of our Lord's Manhood and to give it prominence and influence in Christian thought and life. But these writers have, as it seems to us, fallen into grievous error, partly because they under-estimated the real hold on the Humanity of Christ in the traditional theology of the Universal Church and the fact that the Tractarian teaching on this subject needed only

¹ Isaiah liii. 6.

to be
and p
value
His b
of His

It
though
hood
Son o
by foc
in way
tempt
His c
prayer
knowl
action
knowl
He po
hood
by hu
ordina
much
been
attribu
to the

It
logical
necess
Epistle
is val
origina
for Se
investi
second
pretati
himsel
senten
But th
St. Pa
closely

'Ho
of the I
specula

to be drawn out and developed and in no way to be reversed, and partly because they overlooked the extent to which the value even of the Manhood of our Lord depends not only on His being personally God, but also on His being in possession of His Divine attributes at every stage of His earthly life.

It is indeed of incalculable importance to Christian thought that the reality and completeness alike of the Manhood itself, and of its processes, should be maintained. The Son of God willed that His human body should be sustained by food and sleep; He willed to learn in His human mind in ways by which His creatures learn; He willed to resist temptation and to live a holy life by the use of means which His creatures use, the action of the will, Holy Scripture, prayer, thanksgiving, and the gifts of the Holy Ghost. The knowledge which He would ordinarily use in His human actions would be, we may well believe, neither His Divine knowledge nor that knowledge in His human mind which He possessed by virtue of the personal union of His Manhood with His Godhead, but that which He had acquired by human faculties. Yet however much He may thus ordinarily have been using what was human, and however much the exercise of Divine attributes may at times have been restrained, the unimpaired possession of all these attributes within the sphere of the Incarnation was a necessity to the perfection of His work even as Man.

It has been supposed by some that, whatever the theological consequences may be, the assertion of a 'kenosis' is necessitated by the well-known words of St. Paul in the Epistle to the Philippians.¹ On this point Dr. Gifford's book is valuable. It consists of two parts. The first part—originally published, as we have mentioned, in the *Expositor* for September and October 1896—supplies a careful critical investigation of the meaning of Philippians ii. 5-11. The second part is a series of clear historical notes on the interpretation of this passage. Dr. Gifford has carefully restrained himself from theological questions. Here and there, as in the sentences we have already quoted, he briefly touches theology. But the object of the book is to examine critically what St. Paul said, and the learned author has kept his object closely in view. He himself clearly states his aim:

'However we may regard the tendency of some recent theories of the Incarnation, there can be but one opinion of the danger of speculative theology based upon erroneous interpretation of the

¹ Phil. ii. 5-8.

language of Holy Scripture. And that is the danger which I humbly and earnestly seek to avert' (Preface, pp. vii, viii).

The passage in the Epistle is treated in detail and with much scholarly clearness and accuracy. At the end of nearly one hundred pages of close examination, Dr. Gifford sums up his conclusions in the following statement :

'We may now look back for a moment on the results of our interpretation, so far as they affect the inferences that may or may not rightly be drawn from the passage in regard to the Person and Natures of Christ in His state of humiliation.

'1. We have seen that the word *ὑπάρχων*, "subsisting," as used by St. Paul, denotes both the pre-existence and the continued existence of Christ "in the form of God" (pp. 8-21).

'2. In illustration and confirmation of Bishop Lightfoot's interpretation of the word *μορφή* as "essential form," it has been shown that this sense was well known to contemporaries of St. Paul, that it was adopted generally by the early Greek Fathers, and advisedly restored to our English Bible by the Translators of the Authorised Version in A.D. 1611 (pp. 22-36).

'3. We have noticed briefly the opposite theory of those who contend that the "form" is separable from the "nature" and "essence," that they can exist without it, and that in the Incarnation the Son of God did in fact empty Himself of the "form," while retaining the essential nature, of deity. This error will be further discussed and traced to its source in certain false definitions of Zanchi (pp. 122 ff.), where it will be more fully shown that the Son could not possibly empty Himself of the "form" of God without thereby ceasing to be God in any true sense.

'4. Next we have seen that *ἴσα Θεῷ* denotes the manifold circumstances of glory and majesty, or the particular modes of manifestation, which were an adequate expression of the divine nature of the Son, but not inseparable from it (pp. 37-58).

'5. It has been seen that the meaning of the clause *οὐχ ἀπαγγέλλον ἡγήσατο τὸ εἶναι ἴσα Θεῷ*, and its direct antithesis to *ἀλλ' ἐαυτὸν ἐκένωσε*, clearly prove that what the Son of God laid aside at the Incarnation was that equality of conditions, such as glory, majesty, and honour, which He possessed in His pre-existent state, and to which He prayed to be restored, in John xvii. 5 : "And now, O Father, glorify Thou Me with Thine own self, with the glory which I had with Thee before the world was (pp. 59-74).

'6. We have seen how the Apostle sets forth, on the other hand, the fulness of Christ's humanity in a climax advancing from its most general to its most special features—from that "form of a servant" which includes all God's creatures as "ministers of His who do His pleasure" to that "likeness of men" which unites Him with us in our true nature as made "in the image of God," and finally to that outward guise and fashion in which He was seen as a "man of sorrows and acquainted with grief," humbling Himself yet further in

obedien
cross (p

'St.
of the I
in the o
"never
the nam
Divine

'But
one Per
Human
Apostle

Dur
learned
the Gu
have ac
of the
attentio
and be
nexion
the num
questio
word i
both th
"in the
fined"
express
gramm

'The w
tinuanc

'Th
word, w
context
certainl
Lord, w
pleased
among
the Div
who, "c
plucking
died),"
with the

'No
venture
special
must ha
things p

obedience to His Father's will unto death, even the death of the cross (pp. 75-90).

'St. Paul has thus shown us in brief outline the essential features of the Incarnation, the perfect Godhead and perfect Manhood united in the one Divine Person, who is the subject of the whole passage, and "never to be divided," seeing that the Human Nature, denoted in the name Jesus, is now highly exalted in inseparable union with the Divine (pp. 91-6).

'But as to the manner in which those two natures are united in one Person—as to the degree in which the Deity was limited or the Humanity exalted by their union, *during Christ's life on earth*—the Apostle has said nothing whatever in this passage' (pp. 96-101).

During August and September a series of letters on this learned book has appeared in the correspondence columns of the *Guardian*. We do not think that the writers generally have added considerations of value to Dr. Gifford's treatment of the subject. There is one letter, however, which claims attention alike because of the importance of the point raised and because of the eminence of its author and his close connexion with recent controversies about the Incarnation. In the number of the *Guardian* for August 4, Canon Gore wrote questioning the validity of Dr. Gifford's conclusion that 'the word *ὑπάρχων*, "subsisting," as used by St. Paul, denotes both the pre-existence and the continued existence of Christ "in the form of God." He was careful to state that he 'confined' himself 'absolutely to the grammatical point,' and expressed 'no opinion on the doctrinal matter.' On the grammatical point his contention was as follows:

'The word *ὑπάρχων* implies nothing at all about subsequent continuance, one way or the other.

'Thus in 2 Maccabees xiv. 35, 45, the same construction of the word, with an aorist following, occurs twice, where in one case the context forces us to postulate continuance, and in the other case as certainly excludes it. In the first case it is used of God, "Thou, O Lord, *Who hast need of nothing*, (*τῶν ὄλων ἀποσδεῖς ὑπάρχων*) wast pleased (*ἡδόκησας*) that the temple of Thine habitation should be among us," and the sense requires us to suppose the permanence of the Divine attribute: in the other case it is used for the martyr who, "*while there was yet breath in him* (*ἐν ἔμπνοις ὑπάρχων*), plucking out his bowels, *cast them upon the throng* (*ἐπέσειρε*) and thus died," where manifestly the state denoted in *ὑπάρχων* terminated with the action denoted by the aorist.

'No conclusion of the kind suggested by Dr. Gifford can, I venture to think, be drawn from *ὑπάρχων*. And, in Biblical Greek especially, the habitual use of *τὰ ὑπάρχοντα* for transitory wealth must have deprived the verb *ὑπάρχειν* of any special association with things persistent or eternal.'

This letter, as it seems to us, is open to a good deal of criticism. In the first place, we doubt whether Canon Gore's chosen instance from 2 Maccabees xiv. 45 bears out the inference he draws from it. A careful examination of the passage shows that the condition described in the words *ἔμπρους ὑπάρχων* continued during the action described in the verb *ἐνέσεισε*.¹ If that is so, any argument which can be based upon this passage would support and not weaken Dr. Gifford's interpretation of Philippians ii. 6-7. And, in the second place, Dr. Gifford was very far indeed from resting his explanation of *ὑπάρχων* simply on the general meaning of the word. In his elaborate treatment of it (pp. 8-21) he referred to the 'nature of the imperfect tense' as denoting 'a state in course of continuance not yet ended,' apposite instances in the New Testament of the use of *ὢν* and *ὑπάρχων* in combination with an aorist tense, 'St. Paul's own use of *ὑπάρχων*,' and the 'testimony of very early Christian writers.' For any full knowledge how completely Canon Gore's letter fails to meet this carefully systematized and weighty argument we must refer our readers to Dr. Gifford's book; but we must not abstain from quoting the convincing remarks on the last point but one:

'The most complete proof of all is St. Paul's own use of *ὑπάρχων*. 2 Cor. viii. 17, *σπουδαιότερος δὲ ὑπάρχων αἰθαίρετος ἐξῆλθεν πρὸς ὑμᾶς* . . . ; xii. 16, *ἀλλ' ὑπάρχων πανοῦργος δόλω ὑμᾶς ἔλαβον*.

'Did Titus cease to be zealous at the moment of starting to visit the Corinthians?

'Or does St. Paul mean, in his ironical statement, that, in the opinion of the Corinthians, he ceased to be crafty as soon as he had once caught them with guile? It is impossible, I think, to find or imagine passages more exactly parallel in grammatical construction to Philippians ii. 6 than these two examples of St. Paul's own use of *ὑπάρχων*.

'Another strictly parallel passage is Romans iv. 19, *κατενόησε τὸ ἑαυτοῦ σῶμα [ἤδη] νεκρωμένον, ἑκατονταετής πον ὑπάρχων*.

'In this case it would be manifestly absurd to say that the state indicated by *ὑπάρχων* ("being about a hundred years old") ceased when Abraham "considered his own body as good as dead."

'The only other instances of *ὑπάρχων* in St. Paul's writings are 1 Corinthians xi. 7; Galatians i. 14, ii. 14, which are not so exactly

¹ The whole passage is as follows: *ἔτι δὲ ἔμπρους ὑπάρχων καὶ πεπρωμένος τοῖς θυμοῖς, ἐξαναστὺς φερομένων κρουνηδὸν τῶν αἱμάτων, καὶ δυσχερῶν τῶν τραυμάτων ὄντων, δρόμῳ τοῦς ὄχλους διελθὼν, καὶ στὰς ἐπὶ τινος πέτρας ἀπορρώγος, παντελῶς ἔξαιμος ἤδη γενόμενος, προβαλὼν τὰ ἔντερα καὶ λαβὼν ἑκατέραις ταῖς χερσίν, ἐνέσεισε τοῖς ὄχλοις· καὶ ἐπικαλεσάμενος τὸν δεσπύζοντα τῆς ζωῆς καὶ τοῦ πνεύματος τὰ αὐτὰ αὐτῷ πάλιν ἀποδοῦναι, τόνδε τὸν τρόπον μετέλλαξεν.*

parallel
bined
indicat
cipial c

If
Gifford
said in

In
refers
1896.
the cr
treatm
he sta

'Al
the im
him a
Quarte
to shov
in stat
possess
Lord in
'I

in sup
(pp. 38
μορφῇ
tion th
Θεῷ," E
others
clauses
synod

'If
general
saved h
inferen

No
interpr
it is cl
willed
of His
inferio
truths
guarde
matter
interpr
'æqua

parallel to Philippians ii. 6, because in them *ὑπάρχων* is not combined with an aorist; but in neither of them is there anything to indicate an immediate cessation of the state described by the participial clause' (pp. 16-18).

If there is anything which can be said in refutation of Dr. Gifford's argument on this matter, at any rate it has not been said in Canon Gore's letter.

In the second part of the work Dr. Gifford (pp. 129-34) refers to an article which appeared in our pages in October 1896. He is in evident sympathy with the greater part of the criticisms which we there expressed upon Mr. Ottley's treatment of the passage under consideration. On one point he states his disagreement with what we said:

'After differing so widely from Mr. Ottley as to the meaning of the important word *μορφή*, it is a pleasure to be able to defend him against an objection brought by his critic in the *Church Quarterly Review* on another point. "Mr. Ottley," it is said, "fails to show reason for his view that *τὸ εἶναι ἴσα Θεῷ* means the 'equality in state' with its 'glory and bliss,' as distinct from the common possession of the Divine attributes, or for his assumption that our Lord in the Incarnation parted with this *τὸ εἶναι ἴσα Θεῷ*."

'I believe that Mr. Ottley's views are right on both points, and in support of them I may refer to what I have written above (pp. 38 f.) on the meaning of the phrase *ἴσα Θεῷ* and its relation to *μορφή Θεοῦ*; and if Mr. Ottley has given no reasons "for his assumption that our Lord in the Incarnation parted with this *τὸ εἶναι ἴσα Θεῷ*," he may possibly have supposed that it must be as clear to others as to himself that the logical connexion of the antithetical clauses necessarily excludes every interpretation, except that of the synod of Antioch, *κένωσας ἑαυτὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ εἶναι ἴσα Θεῷ*.

'If Mr. Ottley's interpretation of the passage had been as correct generally as it seems to be on these points, it would probably have saved him from attempting to draw from St. Paul's language some inferences which it by no means warrants' (pp. 133-4).

Now, we have no manner of theological objection to the interpretation which Dr. Gifford thus accepts. Provided it is clearly stated that what is meant is that the Son of God willed to live as Man without the glory of heaven in the days of His humiliation, or that, as Dr. Bright put it, 'He became inferior to the Father as touching His Manhood,'¹ the great truths which we are anxious to protect are sufficiently guarded. And we further most cordially recognize that, as a matter of criticism, Dr. Gifford has shown strong reasons for interpreting *τὸ εἶναι ἴσα* as meaning 'æqualiter esse' rather than 'æqualem esse.' What we demur to, in spite of the apposite

¹ Bright, *Waymarks in Church History*, p. 393.

quotation from the synod of Antioch, is the habitual assumption of many writers that the word ἐκένωσε must necessarily mean 'emptied' in its literal sense. As regards the word itself, the use of it elsewhere in the New Testament does not support such a view.¹ As regards the context, we cannot think there is solid ground for reading into the word anything more than is expressly conveyed in the clause by which St. Paul proceeds to explain it. We shall hardly find a better statement on the subject than that of Bishop Pearson :

'which is not mine, but the Apostle's explication ; as adding it not by way of conjunction, in which there might be some diversity, but by way of apposition, which signifieth a clear identity. And therefore it is necessary to observe that our translation of that verse is not only not exact, but very disadvantageous to that truth which is contained in it. For we read it thus : "He made Himself of no reputation, and took upon Him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men." Where we have two copulative conjunctions, neither of which is in the original text, and three distinct propositions, without any dependence of one upon the other : whereas all the words together are but an expression of Christ's exinanition, with an explication showing in what it consisteth : which will clearly appear by this literal translation, "But emptied Himself, taking the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of men." Where if any man doubt how Christ emptied Himself, the text will satisfy him, by "taking the form of a servant."'²

'The antithetical relation between τὸ εἶναι ἴσα Θεῷ and ἐαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν, enforced as it is by the *direct* contradiction οὐκ—ἀλλά,' which appears to be Dr. Gifford's only ground for believing that there must be an understood genitive after ἐκένωσεν 'denoting "the contents" which are removed' (pp. 72-4), seems to us altogether insufficient to support the view that the use of κενόω must imply an abandonment of some kind. Consequently we are not without fear that, on this particular point, even his cautious and accurate criticism may read into the passage more than is actually contained in it, although, as we have said, we see no theological objection to anything for which he contends. Our hesitation to follow him on this one point does not lead us to doubt the very high value of his book.

Mr. Hawkesworth's *De Incarnatione Verbi Dei* is a work of an entirely different character from Dr. Gifford's *The Incarnation*. It is as wholly devoted to the theological

¹ The other passages in the New Testament in which the word occurs are Rom. iv. 14 ; 1 Cor. i. 17, ix. 15 ; 2 Cor. ix. 3.

² Pearson, *Exposition of the Creed*, Article ii.

aspects
is to th
St. Pa
though
volume
often h
phrase
may be
his ass
certain
His b
powers
powerl
been w
munica
be noti
langua
bility o
In spit
book m
re-writ
the uti
Th

those v
with ra
in pro
even a
Lord
butes.
patient
which
and P
repeate
is to b
Testam
valuab

aspects of the doctrine of the Incarnation as the latter book is to the critical examination of a passage in the writings of St. Paul. Mr. Hawkesworth has evidently given time and thought to the study of his subject. We do not think his volume altogether free from crudities, and his real ability is often hampered by an awkward and provoking style and odd phraseology. There are some ways in which his little treatise may be of use. We wish he could have been less positive in his assertion of the 'Scotist theory,' and that he had avoided certain unfortunate statements, such as that our Lord before His baptism 'in His Incarnation possessed but human powers,' and that His Godhead, 'because incarnate, was powerless to work' miracles (pp. 50, 51). He has hardly been well advised in his attempt to exclude the phrase 'communicatio idiomatum' from orthodox theology. And it may be noticed that he adopts, with evident reference to St. Paul's language, an interpretation of the word *μορφή*, for the untenability of which it is sufficient to refer to Dr. Gifford's work. In spite of his ability and a certain amount of knowledge, his book needs the reconsideration of some points and complete re-writing in a different and clearer form if it is to be given the utility it ought to have.

The harm done by the kenotic theology is not confined to those who definitely accept its conclusions. We often meet with random statements which show how grave is its influence in producing unbalanced ways of regarding the Incarnation even among those who would not seriously contend that our Lord abandoned His Godhead or any of His Divine attributes. What is most of all needed at the present time is patient, careful work at the New Testament and the Fathers which may show in exact detail what is the true Scriptural and Patristic teaching. The *Church Quarterly Review* has repeatedly urged that no support for any form of 'kenoticism' is to be found in the one or in the other. So far as the New Testament is concerned, Dr. Gifford's *The Incarnation* gives valuable aid to the conviction we have thus maintained.

ART. X.—THE DIOCESE OF LINCOLN.

1. *Statutes of Lincoln Cathedral.* Arranged by the late HENRY BRADSHAW, with Illustrative Documents. Edited by CHRISTOPHER WORDSWORTH. Part II. Two Vols. (Cambridge, 1897.)
2. *Diocesan History of Lincoln.* By the late EDMUND VENABLES and GEORGE G. PERRY. (London, 1897.)

OF the two books which we have placed at the head of this article the first is essentially a book for the scholar and the student, the second for the general reader. The first contains the labour of many years; the second also represents the results of long study, but highly condensed and in a popular form. The first enters into minute details of the inner life of the diocese; the second necessarily confines itself to the general outlines of its outer life.

Obviously, therefore, the first of the two books requires the first notice. It is the completion, in two large volumes, of a work the first instalment of which appeared in a single volume in 1892. That volume contained the complete text of the *Liber Niger*, 'the principal repository of those older statutes of Lincoln Cathedral which it was the object of Bishop Alnwick's book [*Novum Registrum*] to supersede.' Mr. Henry Bradshaw, the very learned librarian of the University of Cambridge, made it a labour of love; and his admirably written 'Memoranda' are among the most interesting parts of the work to the general reader. He died, February 10, 1886, before his task was accomplished, but left numerous manuscripts behind him, and the volume was edited, most appropriately for several reasons, by one who bears a 'clarum et venerabile nomen' in the Church at large and in the diocese of Lincoln in particular. The editor is the third Christopher Wordsworth in succession who has distinguished himself in the field of sacred literature; and we heartily congratulate him on having so well carried on the tradition of his grandfather, the well-known Master of Trinity, and of his still greater father, the late Bishop of Lincoln. The name of that great prelate is closely connected with the work. In 1873 Bishop Wordsworth edited at his own cost, with an Introduction in his own beautiful Latin, the *Laudum* and the *Novum Registrum* of Bishop Alnwick, and presented them to all members of the cathedral body, as containing the code of statutes which they were

bound
Alnwick
Dean
cathedral
(1439)
the of
was co
wick's
'Laud
Grey i
Mack
(1412-
nothing
were, i
time v
ratified
Registr
of stat
a little
doing
Mr. Br
itself
the nar
omnibu
novum
and th
accordi
had be
Bishop
tions b
all, the
it had
of the
appreh
worth
ensis a
he is co
Registr
nizes t
autumn
asking
in the
found,'
Bishop
precious

bound to observe. The *Laudum* is the award of Bishop Alnwick on the matters in dispute between the turbulent Dean Mackworth (who was always at war with the other cathedral dignitaries) and the canons. The *Novum Registrum* (1439) was intended to be a new set of statutes in place of the older ones, mainly contained in the Black Book, which was compiled from older documents in 1330. Bishop Alnwick's *Laudum*, or 'Award,' had been preceded by two other 'Lauda'—that of Bishop Fleming in 1420, and that of Bishop Grey in 1434, both occasioned by the same litigious Dean Mackworth, who held the deanery for nearly forty years (1412-1451), and who set three successive bishops, to say nothing of the whole chapter, at defiance. The 'Lauda' were, in fact, additional statutes, framed by bishops of the time with consent of the dean and chapter, and finally ratified by the official seal of the Bishop; but the *Novum Registrum* was, as has been said, intended to be a new body of statutes altogether. Bishop Wordsworth perhaps attached a little too much value to the *Novum Registrum*; but in doing so he followed the almost universal impression until Mr. Bradshaw showed that it was unfounded. The *Registrum* itself claims the highest authority. Its preamble runs, in the name of the Bishop and all the capitular body, 'Nobis omnibus convocatis videbatur saluberrimum fore remedium, novum componere libellum pro regimine Ecclesiæ nostræ,' and the *Novum Registrum* was framed and promulgated accordingly. For nearly two hundred years before 1873 it had been accepted by the cathedral body, and many of Bishop Wordsworth's predecessors had regulated their Visitations by its rules. But Mr. Bradshaw discovered that, after all, the *Novum Registrum* was only a draft code, and that it had not been formally put into use until the closing years of the seventeenth century, when its true character was misapprehended. 'In 1873,' he writes, 'we find Bishop Wordsworth circulating as *Statuta Ecclesiæ Cathedralis Lincolnensis* a printed copy of statutes which shows that, so far as he is concerned, these statutes alone are binding. The older *Registrum* is *ipso facto* abrogated by the act which recognizes the validity of the *Novum Registrum*.' In the autumn of 1879 Bishop Wordsworth wrote to Mr. Bradshaw asking for information about a copy of the *Novum Registrum* in the Library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, and 'I found,' says Mr. Bradshaw, 'it was no mere transcript of Bishop Alnwick's book, but an original copy of the most precious description, and full of a living human interest

possessed by very few books of the kind. I was deeply interested, and tempted to pursue the search.' He was greatly assisted by the labours of Canon Wickenden, who spent the greater part of eight years at Lincoln 'in arranging the chapter muniments with loving care and exquisite skill and neatness,' but who was prematurely called to his rest in October 1883, before Mr. Bradshaw's labours were finished. Mr. Bradshaw's first attention was of course paid to the older statutes contained in the Black Book, and 'I can truly say,' he writes, 'I have never been engaged in such an interesting piece of anatomical work as transcribing the Black Book.' He gave spare time as he could spare from 1879 to 1884 to the work, but, alas! he, too, was prematurely cut off. Canon Wordsworth took up the work, and the result was the publication in 1892 of the first volume of the book, of which the two volumes now before us are the completion. In these later volumes we miss the charming pen of Mr. Bradshaw, and are sometimes tempted to exclaim, 'O for the touch of a vanished hand!' But Canon Wordsworth, too, writes in a scholarly style, and he naturally knows more about the subject of Lincoln than Mr. Bradshaw, a stranger, could possibly do. He has also had more leisure for research; hence the work has assumed far larger proportions than Mr. Bradshaw ever intended; and hence, also, the two new volumes just issued are at least as valuable as their predecessor. The three together touch upon the whole history of Lincoln Cathedral—and therefore practically of the diocese—from its first foundation to the present day, ranging from the charter of William II. in 1090, which confirmed the grant of William I. to Bishop Remigius, down to the form of appointing a cathedral chorister in 1895. Hence they are most valuable acquisitions to our knowledge of the great diocese of Lincoln.

The *Diocesan History*, from its size and general appearance, may seem to be a book of a very different calibre; but it, too, is the work of real students. The late Archdeacon Perry, whose loss is lamented by all true lovers of Church history, is the writer of the greater part and the editor of the whole. But the task was originally entrusted to the late Precentor Venables, a well-known antiquary and accomplished writer, who, however, had so much literary work on hand that he was not able to accomplish more than ninety-one pages before his lamented death in 1895. Archdeacon Perry just managed to complete the remainder before he, too, was called away in February 1897; and he concludes his preface

with
great

I
work
the c
work
very
festly
cially
with
bonu
exec
the r

A
work
which
Chur
once
our C

It
the di
ing r
withi
have
a gra
ing d
grasp
of E
deaco
ten p
sway
those
sity o
was s
rest o
high
was t
will
with t
Linco
allowi
enorm
Linco
were
after;
VOL

with the words, 'For the latter portion of the work I am greatly indebted to the assistance of Canon Overton.'

It will thus be seen that we have in this little volume the work of experts, not of amateurs. Perhaps it is owing to the change of writers, and the removal of both before the work actually appeared, that it suffers from the drawback of very imperfect editing. Careless slips, many of them manifestly printer's errors, abound. But we do not desire, especially under the circumstances, to dwell upon these; for without at all applying the principle *de mortuis nil nisi bonum*, we can honestly say that, speaking broadly, the execution of the work is worthy of its great subject and of the reputation of its writers.

And now, under the competent guidance which these works supply, let us turn to the history of that great diocese which was once by far the most extensive in our National Church, and which even now, though happily shorn of its once vast proportions, is still a large and important factor in our Church system.

It almost takes one's breath away to contemplate what the diocese of Lincoln was in the Mediæval Church. Stretching right away from the Humber to the Thames, including within its limits no fewer than ten counties, it must indeed have been unmanageable by any one single hand. But what a grand position a mediæval Bishop of Lincoln held! Looking down from his sovereign hill, he held, so to speak, in his grasp the 'lads' of Oxford with his right hand and the boys of Eton with his left. With his seven eyes (*alias* archdeacons), now reduced to the normal number of two; with his ten palaces and his forty manors; with ten counties under his sway; with his vast revenues, which were twice the value of those of London itself, he stood unique. The great University of Oxford, far greater in proportion then than it is now, was simply a portion of his diocese, within his rule like the rest of it; the chancellor of the University, a title which the highest subjects in the land now think it an honour to bear, was then simply his official or deputy, bound to carry out his will. One cannot help feeling a sort of sneaking sympathy with those who, when the diocese of Ely was carved out of Lincoln in 1108, complained loudly against Bishop Bloet for allowing such a thing to be done, declaring it to be 'an enormous deterioration of his church,' and that he had 'robbed Lincoln of one of her fairest daughters.' However, there were still too many daughters left to be properly looked after; and the mere physical impossibility of working so

vast a diocese caused too many of the bishops never to dream of making the attempt. They lived as magnificent feudal barons, now at this palace and now at that; they were statesmen, courtiers, friends and counsellors of kings, sumptuous entertainers, or great Churchmen, fighting the battle of the Church at large, protectors and champions of their clergy, but not their fathers in God in any individual sense.

The various alterations in the extent of the diocese, both before and after Lincoln became the Bishop's stool, are bewildering. Passing over what may be called the missionary rather than the diocesan stage, when Paulinus preached and baptized in Lincolnshire, when Theodore made it part of the vast see of Mercia of which Lichfield was the centre, when it was for a short time under the rule, so far as it was under any rule, of the saintly Chad, we come to its diocesan history proper, when the same Theodore established a bishopric of Lindsey or of the Lindisfari, 'the men of Lindsey,' in 678; but the history of this early diocese is obscure. It was not always even in the same kingdom. Being the border-land between the two powerful kingdoms of Northumbria and Mercia, it was sometimes claimed by one, sometimes by the other, according as one or the other predominated. We cannot even identify with an absolute certainty the Bishop's stool. It was at Sidnacester, and Sidnacester was probably, but not certainly, Stow. Stow is now an insignificant village between Lincoln and Gainsborough, but contains a magnificent Norman church, built on the site of an earlier church which was destroyed by the Danes. It was, and still is, called the mother church of Lincoln. About two hundred years later the Danes made utter havoc of Christianity in Lincolnshire; and the bishopric of Lindsey was in abeyance for a century. It was then merged in the see of Leicester, which had been founded by the same Theodore at the same time. In 965 A.D., owing to fresh incursions of the Danes, both were merged in the see of Dorchester, another insignificant village near Oxford. This arrangement continued until the Norman Conquest, one of the many important ecclesiastical changes resulting from which was the transference of bishops' sees from villages to large centres. The first of these transferences was that of the Dorchester bishopric to Lincoln, a change which was permanently stamped by the erection of the cathedral on the hill, under the first true Bishop of Lincoln, Remigius. In 1108-9 it was relieved of one of its ten counties, Cambridge, by the establishment of the see of Ely; and in this

state i
1541 i
boroug
Oxford
county
it. Th
was r
bishop
Th
called,
Canon
of the
require
and to
criteria
episcop
Englis
saintlin
on Can
the late
saint li
with w
royal s
greatest
bishops
claim r
There
not obt
that he
secreta
very p
few, if
ungraci
too nar
unrival
place w
secure f
also du
which t
Hunting
Stow be
which n
think o
made I
college

state it continued for more than four hundred years, when in 1541 it was diminished by the foundation of the see of Peterborough, and again in 1542 by the foundation of that of Oxford; but as a set off against these diminutions, the county of Nottingham was taken from York and attached to it. Thus it continued until 1884, when it again lost, or rather was relieved of, Nottinghamshire by the foundation of the bishopric of Southwell.

The history, then, of the Diocese of Lincoln, properly so called, begins with the Norman Conquest. With that event Canon Venables thinks that there was 'a general elevation of the character of the episcopate.' This seems to us to require some modification. If learning, magnificence, culture, and touch with the general life of Christendom are the only criteria of elevation, then unquestionably the Norman episcopate was far more elevated than that of the early English Church. But if humility, piety, self-denial—in fact, saintliness—is to be taken into account, the comparison is not, on Canon Venables' own showing, altogether favourable to the later date. Compare Remigius, for example, with a real saint like St. Chad, the first bishop who had anything to do with what was afterwards the diocese of Lincoln, or with the royal saint Oswald, whose bones were laid in one of our greatest abbeys, Bardney, or with the last of the English bishops, St. Wulfstan, with whom, however, Lincoln can claim no special connexion, and the contrast is too painful. There is an uncomfortable doubt as to whether Remigius did not obtain his bishopric by bribery, and no doubt whatever that he obtained the godless red king's consent to the consecration of his newly erected cathedral by a bribe; while his very partial biographer, Giraldus Cambrensis, can adduce few, if any, instances of his saintliness. It would, however, be ungracious and ungrateful in Lincoln to scan his shortcomings too narrowly; for to him she owes her first cathedral on its unrivalled site, 'strong as the place was strong, fair as the place was fair; as acceptable to the servants of God as it was secure from the attack of all her enemies.' To Remigius is also due the establishment of the seven archdeaconries into which the vast diocese was divided—Bedford, Buckingham, Huntingdon, Leicester, Lincoln, Northampton, and Oxford, Stow being of a little later date. To him also is due the fact, which most men will think an advantage, though a few may think otherwise, that, though he had been a monk himself, he made Lincoln a secular foundation, establishing there a college of secular canons, not monks. The next two bishops,

Bloet and Alexander, had even less of the saint about them than Remigius, but both had the merits as well as the defects of the Norman episcopate. Bishop Bloet was lavish in his benefactions, a patron of learning, a distinguished statesman, who had been before his elevation chancellor, and was afterwards justiciar to Henry I.; Bishop Alexander was a temporal potentate rather than a spiritual father, but to him Lincoln owes the restoration of its cathedral on a grand scale after its partial destruction by fire in 1142.

But it is not until we come to St. Hugh of Avalon in the closing years of the twelfth century that we find a veritable saint among the Bishops of Lincoln; and him we had to borrow from Burgundy. He was tempted by Henry II. to leave the Grande Chartreuse and take charge of the King's decaying Carthusian monastery at Witham. The circumstances of his election to the bishopric of Lincoln were honourable both to the electors and the elected. Henry, with characteristic arbitrariness, forced him upon the chapter, who naturally objected to the choice of a lately imported foreigner; but they were reluctantly forced to yield to the king's will. St. Hugh, however, was not the man to accept a post thus grudgingly bestowed upon him. With righteous indignation he refused to be bishop under such circumstances, and then the chapter, admiring the magnanimity of the man, not only elected him again freely, but pressed the post upon him; and, happily for Lincoln, Hugh yielded, and commenced his glorious episcopate in 1186. Lincoln has had many great bishops, but her greatest is St. Hugh. He combined all the merits of the early English and the Norman prelates, with none of the defects of either. He had all the beautiful humility, unworldliness, unselfishness, moral courage, devotion to spiritual and benevolent work, which was so attractive in men like St. Aidan, St. Chad, St. Cuthbert, and St. Alphege; and at the same time the culture, the administrative powers, and, in a sense, the magnificence, which distinguished the Norman prelates. Archdeacon Perry was in his element when he recounted the incidents of this saintly bishop's life, for he had already written a full biography of him, doing thereby a service to the general reader, who could hardly be expected to grapple with the *Magna Vita*. It must suffice here to touch very briefly upon the benefits which accrued to Lincoln from the episcopate of its greatest ruler. How he bravely stood up against three powerful and tyrannical kings—Henry II., Richard I., and John—and in each case carried his point, which, it is needless to say, was the right point, and

won the
putation
that of
diction
how h
cared
to him
which
laws,
even v
ing th
which
on a s
found
how h
and w
cannot
disting
is great
for fou
AF
and H
St. Hu
Grosse
useful
the ear
great l
for nin
' a refe
then i
rally l
Grosse
nicans
secured
began
tation
measu
strictn
feared
Perhap
now ca
the lea
becam
that he
over b

won them all over to his side—how he acquired such a reputation for sanctity, that men valued his approval more than that of kings themselves—how eagerly they sought his benediction, and how timidly they shrank from his malediction—how he befriended the poor, tended personally the lepers, cared for the little children, attracted even the dumb animals to him ; how steadfastly he set his face against the abuses which prevailed, preventing the execution of the cruel forest laws, refusing to institute unsuitable persons to benefices even when they were *protégés* of a pope or of a king, protecting the poor persecuted Jews ; how he rebuilt his cathedral, which had been partially destroyed by an earthquake in 1185, on a scale of far greater magnificence than before ; how he founded a guild for the purpose of defraying the expenses ; how he had the good sense to insist upon the fact that holiness and wisdom were far better credentials than reputed miracles, cannot here be told in detail. Suffice it to say, that of all the distinctions which the diocese of Lincoln has enjoyed, none is greater than the fact that it had such a man for its bishop for fourteen years.

After two useful, if not brilliant, bishops, William of Blois and Hugh of Wells, we come to one who was second only to St. Hugh of Avalon—*longo sed proximus intervallo*. Robert Grosseteste, who, like St. Hugh, has been the subject of a useful little biography by Archdeacon Perry, was more 'of the earth, earthy,' than his saintly predecessor ; but it was a great honour to Lincoln to have had such a man for its bishop for nineteen years (1235-1254). Grosseteste was essentially 'a reformer before the Reformation ;' and as the Friars were then in their first glory in England, a reformer would naturally look to them as his best agents in the work of reform. Grosseteste had been a patron of the Franciscans and Dominicans at Oxford before he became a bishop ; and he at once secured their help in his diocese, of the whole of which he began to make a personal visitation. The result of this visitation was that he issued a body of very severe disciplinary measures. These were doubtless needed, but the bishop's strictness gave him the character of a martinet, and he was feared and respected rather than beloved in his diocese. Perhaps there was something of the spirit of what we should now call 'the Oxford Don' about him, for he had long been the leading spirit of the great University of which he now became the actual head. It was in connexion with Oxford that he first showed his determination not to be domineered over by Rome, whose power in England was now at its height.

In 1237 a great council had been held in London, under the presidency of Cardinal Otho, the Roman Legate, an arrangement which would never have been tolerated at an earlier period. The Cardinal and his retinue then paid a visit to Oxford, when a riot broke out between them and the students which led to the University being placed under an interdict. Grosseteste took up the cause of the University, and succeeded in procuring the withdrawal of the interdict. Soon after he delivered his whole diocese from the exorbitant exactions which the Papal Court imposed upon it; he waged war against the claims of religious orders (always the stronghold of the Papacy in England) to be exempt from episcopal control; he ejected the monks from alien priories which had become abnormally corrupt; he forced the king himself to carry out the provisions of the Great Charter, which, to the disgust of Rome, had stipulated that the Church of England should be free; he absolutely refused to admit the Pope's own nephew, a mere boy not in holy orders, to a prebend in Lincoln Cathedral; and he boldly appealed to the whole nation to defend its National Church from Roman extortion. Thus the diocese of Lincoln had the honour, in the person of its great bishop, to be the first to stem the tide of Papal tyranny which threatened to sweep away the independence of the English Church. Grosseteste naturally found little favour with the monkish historians; and, as he was in his work of reform brought into collision with his own chapter, he had not always their good word. But posterity generally does justice to the true character of men in the long run; and the name of Grosseteste has deservedly been held in high honour by the English Church generally and the diocese of Lincoln in particular.

No names that will bear a moment's comparison with those of St. Hugh and Grosseteste appear in the list of *bishops* between the Norman Conquest and the Reformation; but the name of one who never was a bishop, nor indeed a dignitary at all, is a household word among many who know little or nothing about our two great mediæval prelates. John Wiclif, though a native of the neighbouring diocese of York, passed the whole of his public life in England in the diocese of Lincoln; for all the various places of his abode—Oxford, Fillingham, Ludgershall, and Lutterworth—were within its limits. Thus our diocese has the honour of having had the first translation of the whole Bible into English done within its borders. The followers of Wiclif were naturally very numerous in the diocese, Leicester especially, from its proxi-

mity
bish
favou
opini
usual
once
ment
which
Com
and t
not e
with
Flem
proc
the A
E
again
for th
by a
Linc
great
ing l
of th
and
main
wort
I
the
spec
shire
rally
if co
tion
Linc
Corp
(Bis
foun
and
of M
Alm
Can
fath
thro
sole

mity to Lutterworth, being a stronghold of Lollardism. Two bishops of Lincoln (Repyngdon and Fleming) had once been favourable to Lollardism; but when they changed their opinions they persecuted their former co-religionists with the usual zeal of converts. Archdeacon Perry dwells more than once upon the readiness of Lollards to recant; but he does not mention the fact that the passing of the first persecuting act which disgraced our Statute Book—the act ‘*De Hæretico Comburendo*’ of 1401—was expressly directed against them, and that therefore they had a temptation to recant which had not existed before. The diocese of Lincoln was not connected with the passing of this iniquitous act; but its bishop, Richard Fleming, was mainly responsible for the odious and senseless proceeding of exhuming Wiclif’s bones and casting them into the Avon, which runs by Lutterworth.

Bishop Fleming, however, took a more reasonable course against the Lollards when he founded a college at Oxford for the express purpose of training men to combat Lollardism by argument, not by persecution. This was the origin of Lincoln College, founded by one bishop of Lincoln (Fleming), greatly augmented by another (Rotheram), owing its interesting little chapel lined with cedar-wood, and containing some of the finest stained glass in England, to a third (Williams), and finally having its connexion with the diocese manfully maintained by a fourth, and the greatest of the four (Wordsworth).

Lincoln, indeed, was a favoured diocese at Oxford before the reforms of 1854; not because that University had any special partiality for Lincolnshire men, but because Lincolnshire men had been benefactors of the University, and naturally wished that men of their own county or diocese should, if competent, be the first to reap the benefit of their benefactions. Besides Lincoln College, Brasenose had a Bishop of Lincoln (William Smith or Smyth) for its chief founder; Corpus Christi was founded by a native of Lincolnshire (Bishop Foxe), Magdalen by another (William of Waynflete).

There was another and a more sumptuous educational foundation in which a Bishop of Lincoln took a leading share; and, as one section of this foundation lay within the diocese of Lincoln until 1837, it may be briefly noticed. Bishop Alnwick, who has been already mentioned in connexion with Canon Wordsworth’s great work, was first tutor and then father confessor to King Henry VI.; and it was largely through his advice and direction that the king founded ‘a solemn school, and an honest college of sad priests, and a

great number of children to be there at his cost frankly and freely taught the eruditaments and rules of grammar ;' and in connexion with this, 'the building of a princely college in the University of Cambridge for the erudition of those who were brought up at Eton.' The Bishop of Lincoln has always been, and still is, the visitor both of King's College and of Eton.

Before leaving the Mediæval Church, as it was in the diocese of Lincoln, may we commend the study of it to those who are inclined to compare the pre-Reformation with the post-Reformation Church to the disadvantage of the latter? Do they mourn over the Erastianism and State tyranny brought in by Henry VIII.? These were bad enough ; but what were they in comparison with the monstrous attempt of King Henry II., after having kept the see of Lincoln vacant for six years, in order to pocket its revenues, to force into the great office his own natural son, Geoffrey, who was not even in full orders? The attempt was abortive, chiefly through the good sense and good feeling of the young man himself ; but a later attempt, for which the Pope was responsible, to foist on the diocese another doubtful scion of royalty, Henry Beaufort, at the age of twenty-three, simply to please his father, John of Gaunt, the virtual ruler of England, was only too successful. Do they think that the Reformation threw the apple of discord into the midst of a Church which was all peace and harmony before? Let them read the detailed accounts, all taken from original sources, of the miserable squabbles, the charges and countercharges, between the Lincoln Cathedral dignitaries, given by Canon Wordsworth. Let them ponder well his weighty words, which are amply borne out by the undoubted facts which he alleges :

'Knowing what we do of the internal life of Lincoln [in the fifteenth century], we do not hesitate to say that even in the lowest ebb of spiritual life in the latter years of George III. or under the Regency our Cathedral was in a less corrupt and unhealthy state than it was in the days when Bishop Alnwick held his visitation. In spite of our disgust at some of the methods and the tools of the Reformation in the sixteenth century, we are bound to admit in common honesty that an English Reformation was the only hope for the Church in Lincoln, and that so long as leave should of necessity be sought either at Rome alone, or in the Chapter as it then existed, nothing could be effectually done.'¹

Do they think the Church, as it was, would have reformed itself? Let them read the account given by Archdeacon

¹ *Lincoln Cathedral Statutes*, pt. ii., Introduction, p. clxxii.

Perry
polize
Linco
wheth
delinc
was a
tion o
Let t
Perry
Long
reman
vain.
mona
instit
or ha
there
by th
worth
Long
the n
T
coln
again
that
solely
the d
gener
to wh
the d
in the
vidua
it mu
Holb
most
Gross
mony
indee
Henr
Peter
embr
ment
It
of Li
aggre
Mari

Perry of the monstrous accumulation of preferments monopolized by Wolsey, when he was for a short time Bishop of Lincoln, or by his successor, Atwater, and ask themselves whether they can seriously believe that when there were such delinquents among dignitaries who pulled the strings, there was any chance of reform. Do they mourn over the dissolution of the monasteries and disbelieve in their degeneracy? Let them ponder over the extracts given by Archdeacon Perry from the episcopal registers of Bishops Smith and Longland, documents from which, as the Archdeacon truly remarks, if we cannot derive the truth, we shall seek it in vain. Why, if one tithe of the allegations brought against monasteries by responsible persons were well founded, those institutions must either have perished by their own weight, or have gone through a process of drastic reform of which there were no indications whatever! The episcopal registers, by the way, are exceedingly interesting as well as trustworthy documents, and none more so than that of Bishop Longland, who spanned the gulf between the old order and the new, being bishop from 1521 to 1547.

The new order was not warmly welcomed in the Lincoln Diocese, which was the scene of the first serious rising against it in 1536. Archdeacon Perry has rightly shown that that rising was not, as is commonly supposed, due solely to the dissolution of the smaller monasteries, but to the doings of Henry VIII. and his Reformation Parliament generally. And small wonder that Lincolnshire should object to what was going on; for the result of it all was to reduce the diocese of Lincoln from the richest to one of the poorest in the kingdom. It is perhaps scarcely fair to blame individual bishops, who probably could not help themselves; but it must be owned that neither Bishop Longland nor Bishop Holbeach made any stand in defence of their church from most gigantic and barefaced robbery. A St. Hugh or a Grosseteste would never have surrendered tamely the patrimony of the church without a struggle. The diocese did, indeed, derive one advantage from the arrangements of Henry VIII. The creation of the sees of Oxford and Peterborough relieved it of some of its territory, but it still embraced six counties, and still, by a most inconvenient allotment of space, extended from the Humber to the Thames.

It is a curious fact that though two successive Bishops of Lincoln, White and Watson, were most pronounced and aggressive Marians, the diocese escaped scot-free from the Marian persecution; in fact, it was in one sense a gainer in

Mary's days; for Bishop Watson persuaded the queen to restore some of the manors of which it had been iniquitously robbed in the time of her father.

A considerable share in what is called the Reformation Settlement was taken by persons connected with the diocese of Lincoln. Bishop Holbeach and Dean (afterwards Bishop) Taylor were active members of that body which produced the Prayer Book of 1549—the most valuable work done in the reign of Edward VI. By far the most influential of all the clergy in settling the Church of England in the reign of Elizabeth, Matthew Parker, was taken from the Deanery of Lincoln to be Primate; the first Elizabethan Bishop of Lincoln (Nicholas Bullingham) was a vigorous member of the Convocation of 1562, which settled the Thirty-nine Articles; and the most powerful of all Churchmen in the closing years of Elizabeth's reign, the man who, with the Queen, saved the National Church from degenerating into a mere Puritan sect, John Whitgift, was a native of Great Grimsby.

The most interesting incident connected with the Diocese of Lincoln in the early Stuart times was the establishment within its borders of what was absurdly called 'the Arminian Nunnery' at Little Gidding. The cuckoo cry of 'Popery' was of course raised against this noble attempt on the part of Nicholas Ferrar and his saintly little band to carry out 'the life according to rule' strictly within the limits of the Church of England; but we are glad, and, in truth, somewhat surprised, to know that the experiment was not frowned upon by the highest ecclesiastical authority in the diocese. One might have feared that Bishop Williams, who was an able but a rather unspiritual, time-serving prelate, would have joined in the popular cry; but, on the contrary, he visited Little Gidding in person, lent his countenance to the project, and refused to listen to the complaints made against it.

When the National Church was in abeyance for twenty years during the Great Rebellion, Lincoln was deprived of the services of one who promised to be among the best of its prelates, Thomas Winniffe, who was one of the last batch of bishops nominated by the unfortunate King Charles, when both throne and altar were tottering to their fall. In 'the troubles' the diocese suffered severely, owing to the fact that three out of its six counties fell within the limits of that 'Eastern Association' which, under the Earl of Manchester, was exceptionally virulent against the Church. But after

the F
of or
Hugh
for tw
the d
guish
const
held
the t
with
deser
which
years
to be
cuto
more
tips
learn
with
were
little
wou
Lin
dign
tion
dist
othe
It
mu
upc
of t
stan
of t
Buc
abo
day
shi
sub
a
Co
of
the
sul
pr
17

the Restoration, Lincoln was honoured by the appointment of one as bishop who was worthy of the post which St. Hugh had once held. Robert Sanderson only held the see for two years (1662-1664), but he had been connected with the diocese from his youth upwards. He had been a distinguished fellow of the college at Oxford which, by name and constitution, was most of all connected with Lincoln; he had held a benefice in the diocese, Boothby Pagnell, all through the troubles, being exchanged, as a sort of prisoner of war, with a neighbouring Puritan minister; and then he was most deservedly promoted to the headship of the diocese with which he had been so long connected. During the two short years of his tenure he showed what a Christian bishop ought to be. Staunch Churchman though he was, he was no persecutor of nonconformists, but strove to win them over by a more excellent way; scholar and divine though he was to the tips of his fingers, he did not regard Lincoln as a seat of learned leisure, but was most energetic in his diocesan work; with a reputation which stood high, even in days when there were giants in the land, he was yet humble and docile as a little child. If the age of canonization had not passed, he would surely have been known as St. Robert of Lincoln. Lincoln, indeed, was exceptionally fortunate in its highest dignitaries in the period immediately following the Restoration; not only had it a model bishop, but an excellent and distinguished dean, Michael Honeywood, to whom, among other benefits, it is indebted for its cathedral library.

It is rather a defect in our Diocesan History that it dwells too much upon the personal history of the bishops, and too little upon the general life of the Church. The bishop is the *head* of the diocese, but he is not *the* diocese. It would, for instance, have been more edifying if instead of a long account of the delinquencies of poor Bishop Barlow, 'the Bishop of Buckden who never saw Lincoln,' we had been told something about the honourable place which the diocese held in the early days of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel. Lincolnshire stood first among the counties in the amount of its subscriptions. A Lincolnshire landowner, Sir E. Turner, and a Lincolnshire incumbent, Mr. Adamson, Vicar of Burton Coggles, were chiefly instrumental in introducing the system of 'deputations'—that is, not of persons deputed to advocate the claims of the society, but of persons deputed to receive subscriptions. The Dean of Lincoln, Dr. Willis, was the preacher of the first anniversary sermon of the society, in 1702; and the Bishop of Lincoln, Dr. Gardiner, was one of

the warmest and most effective of its supporters. These facts were surely worthy of a place in a Diocesan History.

The episcopate, however, of Bishop Wake (1705-1716) well deserves the space which the Archdeacon gives it. Bishop Wake was not only a most able and learned man, whose reputation shed a lustre upon our diocese, but he was also a most active administrator and a most zealous reformer of abuses. Moreover, he has been a great benefactor to the historian, by leaving behind him a *Speculum Dioceseos*, in which he gives a detailed account of every parish in his vast diocese. From this account we learn that Lincoln, like the rest of the Church of England, was by no means in so inert a state as is popularly supposed, in the earlier part of the eighteenth century. Catechizing in church was very general; the fasts and festivals of the Church were duly observed in many parishes; and 'the prayer days,' as Wednesday and Friday were then called, were not yet neglected. The *Speculum* was continued by Wake's equally distinguished and equally conscientious successor, Edmund Gibson, who held the bishopric from 1716 to 1723; but after these two great men the character of the episcopate degenerated, and laxity prevailed more and more throughout the diocese, until there was indeed sore need of a revival.

That revival was commenced by a Lincolnshire man, born and bred, a Fellow of Lincoln College, and at one time a curate in the diocese of Lincoln. Unfortunately, through a combination of causes into which this is not the place to enter, the revival did not take that course which consistent English Churchmen would have desired to see it take. The diocese of Lincoln became, and still continues to be, a stronghold of Methodism, which, in spite of the sincere desire of its founder, never *was*, in our opinion, a Church movement, but contained from its very commencement the seeds of separation.

The other section of the general Evangelical Revival, the Evangelical party in the Church of England, rapidly became a power in the diocese of Lincoln. Several of its most noted leaders were, in one way or another, connected with the diocese. Thomas Scott, both as a native of Bratost and curate of Olney; John Newton, as curate of Olney; William Cowper, as an inhabitant of Olney and afterwards of Weston-Underwood; Thomas Adam of Winteringham; Thomas Robinson of Leicester; Archdeacon Bassett of Glentworth; James Pugh of Ranceby, fall under this category; and it was at a clerical meeting at the parsonage of the last-

named
expans
colnsh
great

A
necte
of the
clergy
the d
hund
syste
'Rem
affair
the R
Pret
tatio
Chur
given
He v
and
imm
posi
just
It is
only
repr
the
com
Chu
reg
nin
stro
Ton
tim
red

18:
ha
hap
day
liv
Bu
dic
su
St

These
story.

5-1716)
gives it.
d man,
he was
reformer
to the
seas, in
his vast
like the
inert a
of the
eneral;
rved in
ay and
The
ed and
eld the
at men
y pre-
re was

, born
ime a
ugh a
ace to
sistent
The
be, a
desire
ment,
ds of
revival,
pidly
of its
ected
ratoft
ney;
ds of
ham;
tt of
gory;
last-

named that the nucleus was formed of what afterwards expanded into the Church Missionary Society. Thus Lincolnshire is honourably connected with the rise of both the great Church societies for foreign missions.

Another singularly interesting movement, probably connected with the same party, arose in 1799, with the sanction of the Bishop of Lincoln (Dr. Pretymann). A body of earnest clergy banded together to inquire into the state of religion in the diocese; and having received reports from more than a hundred parishes, they drew up a clear and sensible report, systematically divided into 'Facts,' 'Results,' 'Causes,' and 'Remedies.' The report discloses an unsatisfactory state of affairs, and ends with a tribute to the activity and ability of the Bishop. This was none other than the notorious Bishop Pretymann, afterwards Tomline, who had an unenviable reputation as one who enriched his family at the expense of the Church. But we are glad to see that Archdeacon Perry has given prominence to the other and better side of his character. He was not only a most able man, but a far more energetic and efficient administrator of his diocese than any of his four immediate predecessors, or than his immediate successor. No position is more unfortunate than that of a man who lives just at the turn of the tide, and who does not turn *with* the tide. It is impossible to justify Bishop Tomline's nepotism; but he only did what others had done without a blush and without reproach. And the worst of these abuses in the Church of the eighteenth century were but as a drop in the ocean when compared with similar abuses in the mediæval Church—that Church which some who are better Churchmen than historians regard in their innocence with fond regret. But at the beginning of the nineteenth century public opinion began to set in strongly against nepotism, and the reputation of poor Bishop Tomline, a glaring nepotist, has suffered severely. It was time that the balance against him should be somewhat redressed.

But it was not until the appointment of Bishop Kaye, in 1827, that Lincoln saw a far higher type of bishop than she had seen for more than a hundred years—a type that has happily been maintained without a break up to the present day. It would not be in good taste to write much about the living, or about those who have very near relatives still living. But this we must say, that never in the whole history of the diocese have four such men held the reins in uninterrupted succession. Now and then a bright, particular star, such as St. Hugh, Grosseteste, Sanderson, Wake, has arisen in the

Lincoln firmament ; but then he has always been preceded or succeeded by a much dimmer luminary. But the last four bishops of Lincoln, though men of singularly different types of character, have all been bright lights in their way ; and the diocese has in truth been greatly favoured in having such a succession of men to rule over it. Archdeacon Perry is not given to gush—quite the reverse. But he is stirred to unwonted enthusiasm when he writes of Bishop Kaye, Bishop Jackson, and Bishop Wordsworth. He wisely stops there, and we will follow his example, only adding that the high standard of excellence which has been set seems at present in no danger of being lowered.

ART. XI.—THE LAMBETH CONFERENCE OF 1897.

Conference of Bishops of the Anglican Communion, holden at Lambeth Palace, in July 1897. Encyclical Letter from the Bishops, with the Resolutions and Reports. (London, 1897.)

THE meeting of the Fourth Lambeth Conference of the Bishops of the Anglican Communion naturally leads Churchmen to the consideration both of the nature and authority of the Conference itself and of the documents which it has put forth. The objects with which these meetings of the Bishops were instituted and the position which they were intended to hold were explained with great clearness by Archbishop Longley in his letter of invitation to the First Conference, held in 1867. Two years earlier the Provincial Synod of the Canadian Church had requested the Convocation of Canterbury to consider the possibility of providing that 'the members of' the 'Anglican Communion in all quarters of the world should have a share in' 'deliberations for her welfare' and 'representation in one general Council of her members gathered from every land.' This request was considered by the Convocation of Canterbury, and early in 1867 Archbishop Longley issued a letter inviting all the Bishops of the Anglican Communion to meet at Lambeth in September of the same year. In this letter, after mentioning the appeal of the Metropolitan and Bishops of Canada ; a request of both Houses of the Convocation of Canterbury that the attendance 'not only of' the 'home and colonial Bishops, but of all who are avowedly in communion with' the Church of England should be invited ; a similar request from 'a numerous gathering of

Englis
assem
Churc
and th
the ho
at' th
intend

'I
seek t
gether
brothe
practic
vancer
and to
to incl
'S
lay do
comm
unity
peace

I
of th
a Syn
and c
result
comm
have
misc
of th
of th
have
the
bisho
stead
Conf
form
Syn
A
doubl
can
Bish
of re
by c
on p
whic

English, Irish, and Colonial Archbishops and Bishops recently assembled at Lambeth,' at which 'an eminent Bishop of the Church in the United States of America' was also present; and the 'expressed concurrence' 'of other members both of the home and colonial episcopate who could not be present at' this 'meeting,' the Archbishop went on to describe the intended proceedings and work of the Conference.

'I propose that, at our assembling, we should first solemnly seek the blessing of Almighty God on our gathering by uniting together in the highest act of the Church's worship. After this, brotherly consultations will follow. In these we may consider many practical questions, the settlement of which would tend to the advancement of the kingdom of our Lord and Master Jesus Christ, and to the maintenance of greater union in our missionary work, and to increased intercommunion among ourselves.

'Such a meeting would not be competent to make declarations or lay down definitions on points of doctrine. But united worship and common counsels would greatly tend to maintain practically the unity of the faith; whilst they would bind us in straiter bonds of peace and brotherly charity.'

It was thus made clear from the outset that the meeting of the Bishops was to be of the nature of a Conference, not a Synod or Council; that the objects of it were deliberation and discussion and common worship; and that its immediate results could take the form only of recommendations, not of commands. With regard to subsequent Conferences, pains have been from time to time taken to prevent or to remove misconceptions as to their nature and powers; and the records of the Convocation of Canterbury, as well as the proceedings of the Conferences themselves, contain indications that they have throughout been regarded by subsequent Primates in the same light as that in which they were viewed by Archbishop Longley. It is of importance that Churchmen should steadily keep in mind the fact that any resolutions of such a Conference could only receive authoritative sanction by their formal and constitutional adoption by the various Provincial Synods of the Church.

All along there have been those who have expressed doubts whether an unauthoritative Conference of this kind can be of any real utility. It was feared by some that even Bishops might, in such a meeting, speak without a due sense of responsibility, and consequently not without rashness, and by others that sensible men would not spend time and pains on giving useful expression to the results of deliberations which were to have no formally binding practical effect.

Events have proved that the sense of responsibility has been markedly present among members of the Conference, and that there certainly has been no want of elaborate consideration as to the exact force of words used either in reports of committees or in resolutions of the Conference itself. And it might well have been hoped from the first—as the results have shown there was good reason for hoping—that deliberation and consultation and discussion in an earnest and religious spirit would be of real value, quite apart from any specific results to which they might lead.

Yet we cannot disguise from ourselves that there is much food for thought in a paper which has lately been written by one of the Bishops who has attended three Lambeth Conferences, in which he has expressed his opinion that

‘the nett result is somewhat disappointing. Nothing is settled; no perplexing problem solved; no burning question bravely grappled with.

‘And so, apparently, it will always be, if the Lambeth Conference continues on its present basis—viz. a friendly gathering of Bishops, invited to talk over matters of general interest, not to settle disputed questions by a formal pronouncement . . . We have indeed now got our Central Consultative Body, but its action is so jealously guarded that it will most likely expire of inanition.

‘Hence not one single question—not even Moravian Orders, which has hung fire since 1878, and about which the Committee on Foreign Relations had before then sufficient material on which to form a conclusion—has been settled by this conference.

‘Perhaps the conference has become too large to be a good workable assembly, and is, like all unwieldy assemblies, timid in its action, and prone to compromise and postpone matters. But unless future conferences feel their way more boldly to speaking with some authority on points submitted to them, or which (from the nature of the case) are forced on their notice, it is difficult to see how the world-wide Anglican communion is to resist the gradual and imperceptible but irresistible forces which tend to disintegration.’¹

We should have thought there were many signs of increasing unity of spirit between the various parts of the Anglican communion, and that the course of events since the first Lambeth Conference met in 1867 has been of a kind rather to appease than to excite fears of ‘disintegration’; but we recognize the truth involved when the respected writer from whom we have quoted speaks of timidity and proneness to compromise and postponement. We question, however, whether he is wise in his apparent desire that the Lambeth Conference

¹ From a paper in the *Peterborough Diocesan Magazine*, by Bishop Mitchinson, reprinted in the *Guardian*, September 1, 1897.

should
tions h
to be
a Cou
throug
of dic
form
The
greete
Cante
realiz
either
Engla
outsid
groun
on an
we m
the fo
the m

T
reviva
tury
the cl
devot
aimed
the C
time
to the
from
Bisho
be la
law
action
autho
at th
to ho
be ta
beari
of th
of co
the
the
It is
need
dual
vo

should become a body empowered 'to settle disputed questions by a formal pronouncement.' There is very much yet to be done before we are ready for the summoning of such a Council as could be, to any real extent, authoritative throughout the Anglican Communion. The development of diocesan and provincial government in its constitutional form has, as yet, made but little progress in England itself. The bright hopes with which some earnest Churchmen greeted the recovery of the meetings of the Convocations of Canterbury and York have not been followed by an adequate realization. Diocesan synodical action has been little seen in either of these provinces. Metropolitans and Bishops in England have been slow to use their true powers. And while outside England there has been very much which affords grounds both for thankfulness and hope, yet we do not find on any large scale in Synods and Councils the force for which we may well look, we do not hear of much enthusiasm for the formation of needed Provinces, or of due development in the methods of provincial government.

The course which events in England took during the revival in Church teaching and ceremonial of the present century necessarily led to much individual action on the part of the clergy. The Bishops mostly spent such energy as they devoted to the matter in trying to check a movement which aimed at the recovery of the true outcome of the life which the Church in England possessed, and it was inevitable for a time that many clergy should have to choose between loyalty to the commands which their own part of the Church inherited from the Universal Church and consideration for an individual Bishop. It was necessary for a time that men who desired to be law-abiding should resist injustice to which the name of law was given. One of the results of the unfortunate line of action of too many English Bishops was that the idea of authority was weakened. A further result may be observed at the present time in the view which many clergymen seem to hold that their private wishes and opinions and fancies may be taken as law. We intend to return to this subject later. Its bearing on our present point is that the hope for the recovery of the true idea of authority lies in the existence and action of constitutional authoritative bodies. In the government of the Church the Priest and the Bishop and the Metropolitan, the Diocese and the Province, have each their due position. It is only as the whole system is rightly working that the needed spirit of submission to control on the part of individuals can be hopefully anticipated.

Moreover, if we are rightly and safely to have any larger body than a provincial synod possessing powers 'to settle disputed questions by a formal pronouncement,' the provinces and their synods must themselves be strong.

In our judgment, then, it is a mistake to be looking to the present Conferences to do work of a kind different from that which they have on four occasions done. They exist for the purpose of union in worship, deliberation, discussion, suggestion. The more formal work of pronouncements and commands can only rightly come as a sequence of various constitutional processes. The present need with regard to it is the active and careful development throughout the Anglican communion of Catholic methods of Church government in the powers of the Bishop and Metropolitan, the Diocesan and Provincial Synods.

It is time that we turned to the proceedings of the Conference of 1897. These have been published in a convenient form by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. The pamphlet contains a letter from the Conference, sixty-three resolutions formally adopted by the Conference, eleven reports of committees, and a reprint of the report on the subject of purity which was unanimously adopted by the Conference of 1888, and has been commended to the clergy and laity by the Conference of 1897.

The *Letter* opens with words familiar to the readers of the *Letters* of earlier Conferences.

'To the Faithful in Christ Jesus, greeting—We, Archbishops, Bishops Metropolitan, and other Bishops of the Holy Catholic Church in full communion with the Church of England, one hundred and ninety-four in number, all having superintendence over dioceses or lawfully commissioned to exercise Episcopal functions therein, assembled from divers parts of the earth at Lambeth Palace, in the year of our Lord 1897, under the presidency of the Most Reverend Frederick, by Divine Providence Archbishop of Canterbury, Primate of All England, and Metropolitan, after receiving in Westminster Abbey the Blessed Sacrament of the Lord's Body and Blood, and uniting in Prayer for the guidance of the Holy Spirit, have taken into consideration various questions which have been submitted to us affecting the welfare of God's people and the condition of the Church in divers parts of the world' (p. 13).

Following a different order from that of the resolutions and reports of committees, and referring to some matters which they do not touch, the *Letter* goes on to the various subjects which have been under the consideration of the

Conf
hind
word
in th
of p
up in
Lord
dead
on th
the t
sprea
ing 't
may
evil i

and t
not f
degra
that
Grac

C
state

the r
of th
and
joine
word
of m
who
again
for t
tion,
this

deep
thes
can
tion
men
of r
driv
add
reg
to v

Conference. Intemperance is described as 'one of the chief hindrances to religion in the great mass of our people'; a word of commendation is given to 'excellent societies engaged in the conflict with it'; it is said to be 'the essential condition of permanent success in this work' 'that it should be taken up in a religious spirit as part of Christian devotion to the Lord.' There is a statement of needed strength on 'the deadly nature of the sin of impurity, the fearful hold it has on those who have once yielded, and the fearful strength of the temptation.' After referring to the 'duty of checking the spread of' 'diseases' connected with impurity, and recognizing 'the terrible possibility that the means used for this purpose may lower the moral standard, and so, in the end, foster the evil in the very endeavour to uproot it,' the *Letter* adds—

'We are convinced that the root of all such evil is in the sin itself, and that nothing will in the end prove effectual against it, which does not from the very first teach the Christian Law that the sin is a degradation to those who fall into it, whether men or women, and that purity is within reach of every Christian who, trusting in the Grace of God, fights the battle of his baptismal vow' (p. 15).

On the subject of the 'sanctity of marriage' the following statement is made:

'The maintenance of the dignity and sanctity of marriage lies at the root of social purity, and therefore of the safety and sacredness of the family and the home. The foundation of its holy security and honour is the precept of our Lord, "What therefore God hath joined together let not man put asunder." We utter our most earnest words of warning against the lightness with which the lifelong vow of marriage is often taken; against the looseness with which those who enter into this holy estate often regard its obligations; and against the frequency and facility of recourse to the Courts of Law for the dissolution of this most solemn bond. The full consideration, however, of this matter it has been impossible to undertake on this occasion' (p. 15).

Now, it would be very unjust not to acknowledge our deep thankfulness to the Conference for much that is said on these three subjects. The assertion that temperance work can be rightly done only on Christian principles, the declaration of the binding character of the law of purity, the statement of the necessity of maintaining the dignity and sanctity of marriage, may well be heartily welcomed. But we are driven to ask whether the collected Bishops could not have added some words of more practical helpfulness alike with regard to temperance methods and on the painful question to which they refer in connexion with purity; and we must

enter our respectful protest against the way in which the subject of divorce is shelved. To warn against the 'frequency and facility of recourse to the Courts of Law for the dissolution of this most solemn bond' is hardly to put in a modern form the stern words of our Lord, repeated by the Church of England in the Marriage Service, and acknowledged by the Conference as the 'foundation' of the 'holy security and honour' of marriage, 'What' 'God hath joined together, let not man put asunder.' And when it is said that 'it has been impossible to undertake' 'the full consideration' 'of this matter' 'on this occasion,' we cannot but be mindful that this is one of the most pressing questions of the day in England, in America, and elsewhere, and calls imperatively for clear and courageous treatment on Christian principles. Time could hardly have been better spent than in the consideration of the Christian law of marriage. Materials surely must have been ready at hand. Some of the Bishops themselves are eminently qualified to treat the subject. It has long been under the consideration of the Convocations of both the English provinces, which would, no doubt, have supplied evidence which they have collected. There are, we are thankful to say, in the Church of England theological experts with an intimate knowledge of patristic and other writings, and of conciliar laws bearing on the subject, who would, we feel sure, have gladly placed the results of their study at the disposal of the Conference. Very much has been published on the subject by competent writers. In a question so pressing, and about which so much material could easily be obtained, it does not beseem the dignity of a large body of bishops to say that 'it has been impossible' 'on this occasion' 'to undertake' 'the full consideration' 'of this matter.'

After some wise words on 'industrial problems' and 'international arbitration' the *Letter* proceeds to speak of 'the organization of the Anglican communion.' On this highly important subject ten resolutions were formally adopted by the Conference. Of these the first four assert the desirability of the continuance of the Lambeth Conferences under their present conditions. The fifth advises

'that a consultative body should be formed to which resort may be had, if desired, by the National Churches, Provinces, and extra-Provincial Dioceses of the Anglican Communion either for information or advice, and that the Archbishop of Canterbury be requested to take such steps as he may think most desirable for the creation of this consultative body' (p. 34).

The
Conf
of pr
associ
circu
exten
polita
sees
Cante
obedi
decla
to the
tain
Engl
that
provi
oath
polita
of re
consi
feren
they
close

inform
recogn
work
rity,
forma
hims
by th
go.
tion
alone
custo

the f
appo
of th
'Tha
over
York
tives
acce
havi
Com
cons
expe

The sixth, seventh, and eighth express the 'satisfaction' of the Conference at 'the progress of the acceptance of the principle of provincial organization,' and a 'hope that the method of association into provinces may be carried still further as circumstances may allow,' and recommend the 'revival and extension' of the use of the title of archbishop by metropolitans. The ninth and tenth suggest that bishops-elect of sees outside the metropolitan jurisdiction of the See of Canterbury should, instead of taking 'an oath of personal obedience to the Archbishop of Canterbury,' 'make a solemn declaration that' they 'will pay all due honour and deference to the Archbishop of Canterbury, and will respect and maintain the spiritual rights and privileges of the Church of England and of all Churches in communion with her,' and that if they are designated to sees within 'any primatial or provincial jurisdiction' they should 'take the customary oath of canonical obedience' to their own primates or metropolitans. Two other resolutions with regard to a 'tribunal of reference' recommended by the Committee appointed to consider and report on this subject were before the Conference, but, we are told, 'after discussion it was decided that they should not be put.'¹ The *Letter* follows somewhat closely the lines of the resolutions adopted by the Conference.

'We propose to form a central consultative body for supplying information and advice. This body must win its way to general recognition by the services which it may be able to render to the working of the Church. It can have no other than a moral authority, which will be developed out of its action. We have left the formation of it to the Archbishop of Canterbury, who already finds himself called on to do very much of what is proposed to be done by this council. Beyond this point we have not thought it wise to go. But we desire to encourage the natural and spontaneous formation of provinces, so that no bishop may be left to act absolutely alone, and we think it desirable that, in accordance with the ancient custom of the Western Church, the metropolitans of these provinces

¹ The two resolutions on which the Conference refused to vote were the following: 'That it is advisable that a tribunal of reference be appointed, to which may be referred any question submitted by Bishops of the Church of England, or by Colonial and Missionary Churches.' 'That it is expedient that the Archbishop of Canterbury should preside over the tribunal, and that it should further consist of the Archbishop of York, the Bishops of London, Durham, and Winchester, and representatives of each province not in the British Isles which may determine to accept the decisions of the tribunal: the Bishops of each such province having the right to elect and appoint any one Bishop of the Anglican Communion for every ten or fraction of ten dioceses of which it may consist: and that the tribunal have power to request the advice of experts in any matter which may be submitted to them' (p. 56).

should be known as archbishops, recommending, however, that such titles should not be assumed without previous communication to the other bishops of the Communion with a view to general recognition. We think it would be well for the further consolidation of all provincial action that every bishop at his consecration should take the oath of canonical obedience to his own metropolitan, and that every bishop consecrated in England under the Queen's mandate for service abroad should make a solemn declaration that he will pay all due honour and deference to the Archbishop of Canterbury, and will respect and maintain the spiritual rights and privileges of the Church of England and of all Churches in communion with her' (pp. 18-19).

What we have already written about the organization of the Church will show how heartily we welcome this part of the *Letter*. Whether or not the proposed 'central consultative body' will prove a useful instrument, the emphasis laid on provincial action, and the recognition that the allegiance due from a bishop is to the metropolitan of his own province are thoroughly faithful to the best traditions of the Catholic Church. We hope we have seen the last of the anomaly of a bishop on his consecration taking an oath of obedience to the archbishop of a province other than his own. It may seem a small point that metropolitans generally should be called archbishops, since the title metropolitan in itself expresses their position and powers. In reality it is of no little importance, because of the educative force likely to be exercised on the minds of Churchmen generally by the use of the word archbishop.

The next subject treated is that of 'Religious Communities.' We do not think there is much in the *Letter*, the resolutions, or the report of the Committee which will be of practical usefulness to those who have studied the subject to any extent for themselves. What is important is the clear recognition by the assembled bishops of the value of the work of religious communities, and of their rightful place in the system of the Church of England. When we call to mind the obloquy and opposition with which the whole idea of the religious life has met, it is indeed a matter for profound thankfulness to find its position in the Anglican Communion thus secured. We observe that the Committee has been requested to continue its work, and to present a further report to the Archbishop of Canterbury in July 1898.

On the 'Critical Study of the Bible' the *Letter* states that such study 'by competent scholars is essential to the maintenance in the Church of a healthy faith,' since 'that faith is already in serious danger which refuses to face questions that may be raised either on the authority or the

genui
down
confid
in the

'begin
ever-in
form o
of the
its pow

It th
subje
as de

T
the v
mitte
is pa
well

'we h
such
other

and

'unc
ture
the
duty.
Him
Law
Him
and
the I

Y
prob
as th
diffe
the
men
littl
diffe
'leg

Hol
char
Old
Apo

genuineness of any part of the Scriptures that have come down to us.' After speaking of the need of 'reverence, confidence, and patience,' it declares that 'the Bible,' 'read in the light of' the 'conviction' 'that Jesus is the Lord,'

'beginning with man made in the image of God, and rising with ever-increasing clearness of revelation to God taking on Him the form of man, and throughout it all showing in every page the sense of the Divine Presence inspiring what is said, will not fail to exert its power over the souls of men till the Lord comes again' (pp. 20-1).

It then commends the report of the Committee on the subject to the 'careful consideration' of 'all Christian people,' as dealing with it 'temperately and wisely.'

The report to which we are thus referred is signed by the venerable Bishop of Gloucester as chairman of the Committee; and, as might be expected in any work for which he is partly responsible, contains excellent statements. It is well that readers of the report should be reminded that

'we have been bidden to study the Bible like any other book, but such study has shown us how absolutely the Bible differs from any other book';

and that there is a duty,

'unchanged by critical results, of humble and prayerful use of Scripture in its separate parts. The example of our Blessed Lord, and the use of the Old Testament in the New, strongly enforce this duty. Our Lord appeals to the Old Testament as witnessing to Himself. He teaches His disciples that all things written in the Law of Moses, and in the Prophets, and in the Psalms concerning Him are to be fulfilled. He dwells, moreover, upon details of type and phrase. He declares that not one jot or tittle shall pass from the Law until all be fulfilled' (pp. 64-6).

Yet, while the report is up to a certain point excellent, and probably represents the best result it was possible to obtain as the work of a committee composed of bishops of widely differing opinions, it fails to make any helpful suggestion on the questions about Holy Scripture which are exercising men's minds; and its final statement appears to us to be of little value in view of the ambiguity attaching to and the differing interpretations which will be placed upon the word 'legitimate.'

'Your Committee,' it is said, 'do not hold that a true view of Holy Scripture forecloses any legitimate question about the literary character and literal accuracy of different parts or statements of the Old Testament; but keeping in view the example of Christ and His Apostles, they hold that we should refuse to accept any conclusion

which would withdraw any portion of the Bible from the category of "God-inspired" Scripture, "profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness" (p. 67).

The need of helpful treatment of practical difficulties raised by recent controversies about the Old Testament has received fresh illustration since the publication of the proceedings of the Conference. In the *Guardian* for September 15 there was a communicated article—though it is not so headed—signed 'Dragon,' entitled 'How shall we teach the Old Testament to Children?' for which in the issue of September 29 the editor was careful to disclaim all 'responsibility' 'further than the belief that' 'its contents' 'were of sufficient interest to justify their publication;' and in the number of the same paper for September 22 a painful letter from the Archdeacon of Manchester appeared. After pointing out that at the present time there is very little teaching of the Old Testament in Christian homes, 'Dragon' expressed a wish for 'expurgated Bibles'! and then went on to argue that in the instruction of children the New Testament should come first, followed by 'carefully chosen selections from Deuteronomy, the Psalms, and the Prophets, chosen for the purpose of teaching and explaining the Old Testament revelation, without any questions of criticism,' and that 'last of all' their attention should be called to the 'historical books, so called,' with regard to which he added:

'Let us point out honestly to them that, as far as we know, we have in the historical books history, drawn from, probably, contemporary documents; history drawn from documents giving traditional accounts of the occurrences, such as the account of the sun standing still at Gibeon; and traditions treated as history, from which moral teaching is drawn. Let us tell them that we cannot at present tell definitely in every case which is history and which is tradition, but that our point is to find out the moral teaching which the story conveyed, first to the Jews, for whom it was written, and secondly to ourselves.'

In Archdeacon Wilson's letter an attack was made on the common practice of teaching 'the youngest children' 'those parts of the Old Testament' 'which are least historical,' and which it is impossible to explain to them as unhistorical,' and this custom, as exemplified in the syllabus issued by the National Society, was described as not being 'religion' and not being 'easy to adapt to religious teaching.' We do not, of course, agree either with 'Dragon' or with the Archdeacon of Manchester on critical questions about the Old Testament; but we are surprised that neither of them appears to recognize that, even on the supposition that the early chapters of

Genesi
tion o
these
duals
though
such
fitted
and sp
the O
bear r
pation
their
Lord.
that c
tine's
the C
of CI
childr
those
in ou

T
study
affirm
autho
mun
with
comp
Sinc
wors
Bish

'dut
assign
servi
ther
fully
spec
pow
vinc
that
the
in s
mur
left
with
Pra

late

Genesis contain mere myths suitable for the religious instruction of the childhood of the race, it may be possible that these are suitable also for the religious instruction of individuals when children. Speaking for ourselves, we should have thought the careful selections from the Book of Genesis in such a syllabus as that of the National Society eminently fitted to be a vehicle of teaching the youngest children moral and spiritual truth; and that what is needed in dealing with the Old Testament is the choice of those parts of it which bear most closely on the need of the Saviour and the anticipations of the Messiah, coupled with careful explanation of their spiritual meaning and their relation to the life of our Lord. Those who have taken the trouble to try have found that children can appreciate the truth involved in St. Augustine's well-known maxim about the intimate connexion between the Old and the New Testament,¹ while the positive teaching of Christian doctrine, gradually increasing in fullness as the children's minds develop, is the best means of anticipating those many difficulties about the Bible and human life which in our days meet them all too soon.

The *Letter* of the Conference goes on from 'the critical study of the Bible' to 'the Book of Common Prayer.' It affirms that the Prayer Book, 'next to the Bible itself, is the authoritative standard of the doctrine of the Anglican Communion,' and that 'it would be most dangerous to tamper with its teaching either by narrowing the breadth of its comprehension, or by disturbing the balance of its doctrine.' Since, however, 'no Book can supply every possible need of worshippers in every variation of local circumstances,' the Bishops 'think it' their

'duty to affirm the right of every Bishop, within the jurisdiction assigned to him by the Church, to set forth or to sanction additional services and prayers when he believes that God's work may be thereby furthered, or the spiritual needs of the worshippers more fully met, and to adapt the Prayers already in the Book to the special requirements of his own people. But we hold that this power must always be subject to any limitations imposed by the provincial or other lawful authority, and the utmost care must be taken that all such additions or adaptations be in thorough harmony with the spirit and tenor of the whole Book. . . . Difficulties having arisen in some quarters with regard to the administration of Holy Communion to the sick, we recommend that such difficulties should be left to be dealt with by the Bishop of each Diocese in accordance with the direction contained in the preface to the Book of Common Prayer "Concerning the Service of the Church"' (pp. 21-2).

¹ St. Augustine, *Quest. in Ex.* 73, 'Quamquam et in vetere novum lateat et in novo vetus pateat.'

The report upon which this part of the *Letter* is based refers to the '*jus liturgicum* which, by the Common Law of the Church, belongs to' the 'office' of the Bishops (p. 149).

The resolutions of the Conference which deal with this point are—

'That the Conference recognizes the exclusive right of each Bishop to put forth or sanction additional services for use within his jurisdiction, subject to such limitations as may be imposed by the provincial or other lawful authority.'

'That this Conference also recognizes in each Bishop within his jurisdiction the exclusive right of adapting the services in the Book of Common Prayer to local circumstances, and also of directing or sanctioning the use of additional prayers, subject to such limitations as may be imposed by provincial or other lawful authority, provided also that any such adaptation shall not affect the doctrinal teaching or value of the service or passage thus adapted' (pp. 44-5).

The difficulties of the Conference in dealing with this subject must have been enormous. To say nothing of the fact that the Books which the different Bishops are in the habit of using are not altogether the same, the circumstances of some of the foreign dioceses differ from those of the English dioceses to the greatest possible extent. We have much sympathy with a great deal that is said in a letter dated July 29, and published in the *Guardian* of September 15. The writer, who signs himself 'A Missionary' and describes himself as writing from a place where he cannot see the *Guardian* until it is 'six or eight weeks' old, pleads that the Book of Common Prayer was never intended for

'lands which are as far removed from "the realm of England, the dominion of Wales, and the town of Berwick-on-Tweed" as India, China, Japan, Nyassaland, Uganda, Borneo, or Honolulu';

argues that it bears too

'clearly on its face the marks left by the ecclesiastical struggles of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries in Europe'

to be altogether satisfactory for new Churches which have known nothing of those struggles; and alleges that it fails to meet the needs of places where services have to be provided for unbaptized persons, and where the rulers of the State and the bulk of the population are heathen. This writer, like the Conference, desires to fall back, with certain safeguards, on the *jus liturgicum* of the Bishops.

'In cases where a missionary Bishop finds himself a member of a province, as in South Africa, the advice and opinions of his "com-provincials," as well as of his own clergy, will doubtless act as a guide

and a
where t
[why C
with his
who ser

It
all the
intend
of con
those
where
to dea

For
who a
standa
Churo
Engla
missio
Churo
elemen
who
privile

In
difficu
of the
itself,
Engl
it see
some

A
'Con
distin
Book

'
may
diver
ing t
taine
thing
discr
so th
Book
send

are

and a check on anything like wilfulness or fancifulness. In cases where the missionary Bishop is directly dependent upon Canterbury [why Canterbury more than York?] he will naturally act (in concert with his clergy and) in deference to the suggestion of the prelate who sent him forth.'

It is obvious that in missionary and colonial dioceses not all the needs of the Church will be met by services which are intended for the use of communicants, that the circumstances of communicant worshippers may be greatly different from those contemplated by the Book of Common Prayer, and that where there is a properly constituted province it has authority to deal with matters of this kind.

Further, the Church in England has to deal with many who are very far indeed from being capable of reaching the standard of worship which in the Prayer Book is set up for Church people. There is no use in disguising the fact that in England the Church's work has to be to a large extent of a missionary character. Whole populations have been lost to Church worship and to Christian life. Services of a very elementary kind may be needed in mission rooms for those who either are unbaptized or have failed to realize the privileges of their baptism.

In recognizing these facts and the existence of many difficulties which, no doubt, were in the minds of the members of the committee of the Conference and of the Conference itself, we wish to emphasize a limitation which the Church of England has imposed on the Bishops which is not always, as it seems to us, sufficiently recognized, and also to point out some of the rights and obligations of the laity of the Church.

At the end of the Preface to the Prayer Book entitled 'Concerning the Service of the Church' there is a very distinct statement on the powers of the Bishop to explain the Book.

'Forasmuch as nothing can be so plainly set forth, but doubts may arise in the use and practice of the same; to appease all such diversity (if any arise) and for the resolution of all doubts concerning the manner how to understand, do, and execute the things contained in this Book; the parties that so doubt, or diversely take anything, shall alway resort to the Bishop of the Diocese, who by his discretion shall take order for the quieting and appeasing of the same; so that the same order be not contrary to anything contained in this Book. And if the Bishop of the Diocese be in doubt, then he may send for the resolution thereof to the Archbishop.'

So far, then, as the services contained in the Prayer Book are concerned, the Church of England has in both her pro-

vinces definitely limited the *jus liturgicum* of individual bishops, by providing that nothing which they allow is to be 'contrary to anything contained in this Book.'

And, with regard to the rights and obligations of the laity, we cannot see that the duty of Sunday worship has been performed when there has been attendance at one or another of the fragments or combinations of services the use of which has been encouraged by the well-meant but practically mischievous Act of 1872, or that the faithful layman has been given that which he has a right to demand when he has been allowed to be present at some such services as, we understand, are not uncommon. Let us illustrate what we mean. We have heard of churches in which at some hour, supposed to be before breakfast, there is the service of the Holy Communion, attended by a small handful of people; and in which, at half-past ten or eleven o'clock, a large congregation assembles for an elaborate musical service, which consists of the Order for Morning Prayer, possibly ending at the third collect, followed by an anthem or hymn, a sermon, another hymn, and a blessing. And we suppose that this large congregation goes home with a comfortable feeling that for this Sunday it has performed its duty towards God, and that, whatever its sins and failings in other ways may be, it has at least discharged the obligation of Christian worship. Yet this congregation, misled by the action of the clergy, has been deprived of opportunities of praise and thanksgiving and prayer and intercession, it has not received the instruction contained in the Epistle and Gospel for the week, it has had no share, either by communion or otherwise, in the Eucharist. And perhaps, on such a Sunday as we have been describing, some good layman, who is a stranger to the church in question, hears among the notices one which tells him that on the next Sunday 'the celebration of the Holy Communion will be after Mattins.' He may be a little perplexed by observing that on the one Sunday he has had the opportunity of receiving the Holy Communion before his ordinary hour or a slightly later hour for breakfast, and that on the next Sunday the Holy Communion is to be somewhat late in the day, but he hopes that at all events he will, in the course of the morning, have the service provided by the Church. However on the Sunday following, though there is the same elaborate and lengthy music, and while there is the Morning Prayer to the end of the third collect and the greater part of the Order of the Holy Communion, the rubric which directs 'Then shall follow the sermon' is simply ignored. And, on this occasion, he hears

the no
Sunda
'a qu
simply
to rem
on an
night
sermo
begin
muni

N
there
the C
rare
follow
merit
woul
ordin
any v
was
afrai
time
on a
mark

T
one
peop
in th
given
Mar
by t
more
this
greg
be l
gene
here

seen
mea
serm

1
in th
riag
auth

the notice that 'the celebration of the Holy Communion on Sunday next will be at eight o'clock,' or 'half-past eight,' or 'a quarter to nine,' or 'nine o'clock,' and he wonders in his simple heart how the regular attendants at the church manage to remember what is the service which they are going to have on any particular day. Nor is his wonder less when, a fortnight later, he finds another variation in Morning Prayer and sermon at the usual hour, and, after it, as a separate service beginning at about a quarter past twelve, the Holy Communion.

Now the old state of things, in which Sunday after Sunday there was the Morning Prayer, the Litany, the first part of the Communion service, and a sermon, and in which, on very rare occasions indeed, the rest of the communion service followed, was unsatisfactory. But it had at least these two merits, that those who went to church knew what the service would be, and that the unfinished Communion service on ordinary Sundays was a constant, if often unheeded, witness to any who followed it in their Prayer Books that the Eucharist was to be regarded as the central act of worship. We are afraid that in a good many English churches at the present time it is a little difficult to know beforehand what the service on any particular Sunday morning will be, and important marks of the position of the Eucharist have been lost.

The rubric after the Creed in the Communion Service is one of very great importance. This is the point at which the people are to be told what are the holy days and fasting days in the ensuing week, at which notice of Communion is to be given, and at which, among other documents, the Banns of Marriage¹ are to be read. After these is the place appointed by the Prayer Book for the sermon. Nothing could mark more distinctly that in the mind of the Church of England this is the chief service of the day, and that the general congregation are to be present at it. The notices which should be known as widely as possible, the sermon which is for general instruction, are directed to be given out and preached here.

The particular place at which a sermon is preached may seem a small matter. It is not a small matter when the real meaning of the direction in the Prayer Book is seen. If the sermon is preached at Morning Prayer instead of in the Com-

¹ The omission of the words 'and the Banns of Matrimony published' in this rubric and the corresponding alteration in the rubrics of the Marriage Service in most modern editions of the Prayer Book are without authority.

munion Service, it will be found to form an additional difficulty, when in any case there must be enough, in the way of teaching English people the real position and claims of the Eucharist. In churches where we find the Holy Communion sometimes at eight o'clock, sometimes at nine, sometimes at a quarter past twelve, sometimes as a sung service without a sermon after Morning Prayer, it cannot be very easy for the congregation to have true ideas on the subject.

The Lambeth Conference included bishops of dioceses with all kinds of populations and conditions. We could hardly expect that its *Letter* should say much in detail on a matter involved in so many complications differing in different parts of the world. We wish that the bishops in England could do something which would exercise a check on the extraordinary variations of services that are only too common and which might tend gradually to lead English Church people generally to sounder ideas of worship, while it should afford to devout laymen some security that in attending church they will not be put off with mutilated services.

We wish, indeed, that we were not of opinion that a want of consideration for the laity is to be found among many of the clergy. The variation of services from Sunday to Sunday, whatever plausible pretexts may disguise the fact, is really a want of such consideration. There are many other signs of it. It is not much encouragement to the busy man who has sacrificed half an hour in the early morning to attend a week-day Eucharist, to notice that the only clergyman present out of a large staff is the one whose turn it is to celebrate, and perhaps to be inconvenienced by the service being some minutes late. It does not help the laity to realize the privileges of church-going when the only priest present in choir for Morning or Evening Prayer is the one who is responsible for saying the office. These are examples of features which may be seen in English Church life at the present day which are, in our judgment, very closely connected together, and which, though the causes of them cannot be put under any one head, are to no small extent due to a spirit which can hardly be described by any more lenient word than lawless. As we have already said, we think the responsibility for the existence of this spirit rests mainly with the bishops who held the English sees at the time of the Tractarian and early ritual movements. We believe that a wisely exercised influence of the present bishops, appealing as opportunity might be afforded in well-chosen ways to the best feelings of candidates for Ordination and the clergy,

might
plac
Chur
dioces

A
to the
safeg
and c
times
of th
of po
the p
the p
was s
which
Letter

poss
of the
culty

A
towa
whic
culti
time
atten

A
the s
touc
emp
in th

'com
conn
duty
instr
the
enco
some
attai

Colo
whic
this
lette

might do much to check it and pave the way for the replacing of authority in its rightful position as we recover the Church's true methods of action in her provincial and diocesan synods.

Attention has of late been called to the grave perils attached to the practice of baptizing infants when there is no adequate safeguard that they will be brought up in the Christian Faith; and certainly the recklessness with which Baptism has sometimes been administered contrasts strongly with the caution of the ancient Church, while, apart from the constant increase of population, the breakdown in many places in England of the parochial system and the present state of education make the problem very different and much more serious than it was some years ago. On this highly important subject, on which, if we had space, we might well write at length, the *Letter* says—

'We desire to impress upon the clergy the need of taking all possible care to see that provision is made for the Christian training of the child, but that, unless in cases of grave and exceptional difficulty, the baptism should not be deferred' (p. 22).

A statement of this kind cannot be regarded as helping towards the final settlement of a question all the elements of which have not, as yet, been sufficiently studied, and the difficulties in which are likely to increase greatly in the course of time; but, so far as it goes, it may well be commended to the attention of the clergy.

After touching on the 'misleading character of many of the statements to be found in those School "Readers" which touch on the history of the Church,' the *Letter* goes on to emphasize the need of theological study, and the difficulties in the way of it in the colonies, and to

'commend to all Christian people, and especially to those who are connected by commercial or other relations with the Colonies, the duty of aiding and establishing colleges and scholarships for the instruction of Colonial students in theology, and we commend to the careful consideration of the Church the question how best to encourage men to give themselves to that study by arranging that some accredited authority shall grant degrees to those who have attained a high standard of proficiency' (pp. 23-4).

This subject leads up to 'the duty of the Church to the Colonies' in other ways. In addition to speaking on the need which some Colonial churches still have of pecuniary help from this country, and the duties of supplying emigrants with letters of commendation, and helping

'the Bishops and clergy of the Colonies in their endeavours to protect the native races from the introduction among them of demoralizing influences, especially the mischief of the trade in intoxicating liquors and noxious drugs,'

the *Letter* has the following statement on a matter which has of late excited much interest and not a little controversy :

'It is a duty to the Colonies to encourage the freest and fullest communion of spiritual life between the Churchmen at home and the Churchmen abroad, and especially between the clergy. Clergymen well fitted for Colonial service are not always well fitted for home service, and clergymen well fitted for home service are not always well fitted for Colonial. And this must, to a certain extent, put a restraint on free exchange of clergy between the two services. But, subject to this necessary caution, it is good for the Church that men should go from one service to the other, and under proper regulations this ought not to be difficult' (pp. 24-5).

In connexion with this part of the *Letter* the report of the sub-committee appointed to consider the operation of the Colonial Clergy Act, 1874, should be read. The sub-committee consisted of the Archbishop of Rupert's Land and the Bishops of Auckland, Ballarat, Bath and Wells, Capetown, Goulburn, Guiana, Manchester, Newcastle, St. Albans, and Sydney. It is to be observed that the majority of the sub-committee were from abroad, while of the four occupants of English sees the Bishops of Bath and Wells and Manchester were formerly in Australia, and the Bishops of Newcastle and St. Albans are known for their keen interest in missionary and Colonial work. The sub-committee recognize that there may be instances in which some little pains may be needed to prevent anomaly or injustice resulting from the Act, and refer to 'a certain soreness' 'in some quarters from' its 'operation,' but decisively express their judgment that they 'do not find themselves able to recommend any attempt to procure a repeal or alteration of the Act itself' (pp. 162-3). We are heartily glad that this position has been taken up. An Act like the Colonial Clergy Act must necessarily lead to some inconvenience. It may sometimes be annoying to a clergyman ordained in the Colonies, for whom it is certainly right to work in England, to have to obtain the permission of the Archbishop of the province. Such difficulties are inseparable from any exercise of discipline, and those who have real knowledge of the facts which bear on this matter regard it as most desirable that the Colonial Clergy Act should remain in operation. Any injustice which might otherwise result from it may be prevented by the care and wisdom of the

Arch
bisho
tainly
that th
this m

We
length
unity
misun
report
length
of the

'TH
purpos
(p. 41)

and th

'W
size the
of revel

We
ing of
Lord f
visible
marrin
all me
which
the hu
the life
injure
that an
necess
closely
and to
be asse
is only
which
Divine
Church

Ca
resolut
and pr
in the
essenti
VOL

Archbishops. The administration of it by the late Archbishop of Canterbury and the Archbishop of York has certainly been eminently careful and wise. We do not doubt that the present Archbishop of Canterbury will continue in this matter the wholly satisfactory policy of his predecessor.

We should not have thought it necessary to dwell at any length on the action of the Conference with regard to the unity of the Church, if it were not for an extraordinary misunderstanding on the part of Cardinal Vaughan. The report of the committee on the subject is of considerable length and deserves attention. The first of the resolutions of the Conference is—

‘That every opportunity be taken to emphasize the Divine purpose of visible unity amongst Christians as a fact of revelation’ (p. 41) ;

and the *Letter*, in identical terms, says—

‘We recommend also that every opportunity be taken to emphasize the Divine purpose of visible unity amongst Christians as a fact of revelation’ (pp. 25-6).

We should have thought it obvious enough that the meaning of the Conference was that the original design of our Lord for His Church, as shown in Holy Scripture, included visible unity, and that the breach of this visible unity is a marring of His Divine purpose, just as it is His holy will that all men should be saved, and the eternal loss of some souls which He Himself contemplates mars what He would do for the human race. It is indeed profoundly mysterious that in the life of the Church human sin should have been able to injure the fair design of God ; and, *a priori*, it might seem that anything rightly described as the Divine purpose must necessarily remain unimpaired. When we come to look closely at the realities of nature and of human life and history, and to apply the great principle of thought which will always be associated with the name of Bishop Butler, we find that it is only in harmony with the many anomalies and shortcomings which God certainly tolerates that visible unity should be the Divine purpose, and that, none the less, the actual historical Church is at this moment outwardly divided.

Cardinal Vaughan, however, has contended that this resolution of the Conference is fatal to the Anglican position, and practically concedes the Roman theory that visible unity, in the sense of intercommunion, is a necessary mark and essential test of the true Church. In an address delivered at

Ramsgate on September 13, after quoting the resolution, he went on to say—

‘A little close attention to its meaning will show (1) that this Resolution condemns, let us hope once and for ever, the false theory that the unity required by Christ among Christians is that *invisible* unity which Protestants say binds all good men together, no matter what sect or form of religion they profess. The Anglican Bishops, on the other hand, now formally declare, that the unity which Christ designed as the unity that is to bind Christians together must be a *visible* unity—a unity so marked and conspicuous that the world can see it, a unity about which there can be no mistake by anyone who has eyes to see, and uses them. It must also be a *real* visible unity, not a fictitious one, which is no unity at all.

‘A little consideration makes it also clear, (2) that this Resolution gives the death-blow to that peculiar High Church theory, which has done evil service in the past, viz. the theory that the Church of Christ is made up of three branches, the Anglican, the Greek, and the Latin. It condemns and rules this theory out of court, because it declares that the unity must be a *visible* unity, whereas it is obvious to the simplest capacity that these three branches, so far from constituting a *visible* unity, exhibit a *visible disunion*. They form three visibly separated, antagonistic, and independent bodies. The branch theory, therefore, and the invisible unity theory both stand condemned by the Proposition promulgated as one of the most important results by the Lambeth Conference. If the Proposition be true its contradictories, of course, must be false.

‘We have here, then, from Lambeth a definite dogmatic statement of pregnant and far-reaching consequence for which we cannot be too thankful. And observe the singular importance attached to the Proposition by the Anglican Bishops themselves. They declare “that every opportunity is to be taken to emphasize it”;—that is, this visible unity is to be emphasized as having been the purpose of the Founder of the Christian Religion; it is to be emphasized as a divine fact contained in revelation; it is to be emphasized now, under the present circumstances, in the present state of controversy, in the present distress in which men are anxiously casting about to find peace and the true Religion.

‘If this Resolution be frankly accepted and fairly pressed to its legitimate conclusion, Anglicans will in future concentrate their whole mind upon the question of visible unity, as a test of the true Church. They will study with a new interest and an earnest determination that wonderful spectacle of visible unity presented to them by the Catholic Church.

‘How marvellously the Anglican Bishops have been directed to co-operate with us, quite independently, by calling men’s minds to that divine mark of the Church, her visible unity! I attribute to them no leanings to Popery. I fully recognize and understand their genuine dislike of the Pope’s Supremacy. Naturally no man likes the doctrine which, if it be true, convicts him of schism and heresy. But, in spite of

this, the
calling p
fact and

Let
doctrin
marks
she pos
exists,
continu
Head o
subject
to by t
Divine
of the
many p
by hun
subject

‘Un
unity is
with H
the “o
Him.
He gav
commi
commu
while o
during
the ble
the qua
times, y
St. Cut
of the
Luna a
the mig
ourselv

W
lution
he is u
than a
can be

¹ In
H.E. C
the lan
Some p
were re
² F

this, the Anglican Prelates have rendered quite invaluable service by calling public attention to the doctrine of visible unity, as a revealed fact and test, and as a divine mark of Christ's Church upon earth.¹

Let us briefly restate the frequently explained Anglican doctrine of the unity of the Church. One of the notes or marks of the Church is the objective or organic unity which she possesses by virtue of the one life of Christ. This unity exists, really, if sometimes invisibly, between all those who, continuing in the Christian religion, are united to Christ, the Head of the Church, by the Sacraments. It differs from the subjective or moral unity which is the visible unity referred to by the Lambeth Conference, which is indeed part of the Divine purpose, but which may be lost without the destruction of the organic unity which is essential to the Church's life, as many parts of the Divine purpose may be and are frustrated by human sin. There is an admirable statement on this subject by Bishop Forbes, of Brechin.

'Unity may be divided into objective and subjective. Objective unity is that inwrought by our Head, Jesus Himself, through union with Himself. It is wrought on His side, by the communication of the "one Spirit," and by the Sacraments, making us all one body in Him. It requires, on our part, continuity of the commission which He gave to His Apostles, and perseverance in the faith which He committed to the Church. Subjective unity is unity of will and inter-communion with one another. Subjective unity may be suspended, while objective unity is maintained. Subjective unity was suspended during the schism at Antioch, yet objective unity is maintained, for the blessed Meletius is a saint. Subjective unity was suspended in the quarrels between the British and Western Churches in the Saxon times, yet nobody doubts of the salvation or sanctity of St. Aidan or St. Cuthbert. Subjective unity was suspended during the struggles of the antipopes, yet no one considers the followers of Peter de Luna as either heretics or schismatics. And this must also apply to the mighty dissension between the East and the West, and between ourselves and the rest of Christendom.'¹

We have called Cardinal Vaughan's reference to the resolution on unity a misunderstanding. It may indeed be so if he is unable to see considerations which go somewhat deeper than a mechanical seminary logic. Yet we doubt whether he can be quite so simple as not to have understood all the time

¹ Inaugural Address delivered at Ramsgate on September 13 by H.E. Cardinal Vaughan on the occasion of the thirteenth centenary of the landing of St. Augustine at Ebbs Fleet, *Tablet*, September 18, 1897. Some parts of this address, including a portion of what is quoted above, were reported in the *Guardian* of September 15.

² Forbes, *A Short Explanation of the Nicene Creed*, pp. 276-7.

what the Conference meant, and to have been well aware that, unless all Christian theology is untrue, it is possible for a part of the Divine purpose revealed in Holy Scripture to be frustrated. If our doubt is well founded it is a matter of profound regret that the chief English representative of the Church of Rome should have stooped to the attempt to make a technical controversial 'score,' while, on the other hand, if he really misunderstood the resolution, such a fact will hardly commend to thinking men his competency to lay down theological truth.

Our last remarks will have shown, even if the general attitude of the *Church Quarterly Review* could have left any doubt on the point, that we have no desire to defend the 'usurped authority of the See of Rome' or the 'unlawful terms of communion' which the Church of Rome imposes. But we could have wished for a little greater caution in some of the expressions in the part of the *Letter* and in the resolutions of the Conference which deal with 'Reformation movements outside our Communion,' much as we welcome the closing words of the report of the committee.

'We venture to say that, as a condition for recognition or inter-communion, there should be satisfactory evidence that the Bodies applying are sound and clear as touching the fundamental verities of the Christian faith, and that the offices for the administration of the Sacraments are in accord with our own liturgical standards' (p. 100).

The last subject dealt with in the *Letter* is that of 'Foreign Missions.' Considerably more space is devoted to it than to any other one matter. We have noticed a recognition of the obligation of foreign missionary work upon Christians, and of the opportunities which are now being afforded for it; a caution against an exaggerated view of the good contained in Judaism or Mohammedanism; a statement that the 'greatest of all difficulties' in 'the work of converting the Jews' 'springs from the indifference of Christians to the duty of bringing them to Christ,' although there is a serious hindrance in the 'severe persecutions to which Jewish converts are often exposed from their own people';¹ an appeal for men 'specially trained' and, if possible, working 'in large groups' for 'dealing with the whole Mohammedan Body'; some words of warning on the subject of 'Native Churches'; and suggestions for avoiding 'apparent collision between

¹ This was denied in an interesting, if not conclusive, letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury by Mr. O. J. Simon, published in the *Guardian*, August 11, 1897.

different
society w

TH
matter
resoluti
statem

'T
ertain
Buddh
constit
correct

TH
work
proced
the ac
bury

TH

'W
our de
we are
Master
another
world
desirin
our de
live an
can de
perpet
with t
surren
may b
abide

A
from
addre
at La
these
and i
and
have
we m
gene
of th
our

different Churches within our communion' or unnecessary conflict with 'missionaries not connected with our communion.'

The report of the committee contains much very valuable matter, and we desire to call attention to the following resolution of the Conference, which is based upon some fuller statements in the report :

'That the tendency of many English-speaking Christians to entertain an exaggerated opinion of the excellences of Hinduism and Buddhism, and to ignore the fact that Jesus Christ alone has been constituted Saviour and King of Mankind, should be vigorously corrected' (p. 36).

The stress laid on the obligation of the foreign missionary work of the Church is a marked and welcome feature of the proceedings of the Conference. It has been emphasized by the admirable sermon preached by the Archbishop of Canterbury in St. Paul's Cathedral at the end of the sessions.¹

The *Letter* ends with the paragraph—

'We have now said what we have to say. We have throughout our deliberations endeavoured to bear in mind the great work that we are engaged in doing and the presence with us of the Lord and Master who has given us this work to do. The effort to counsel one another and to counsel the members of our Church throughout the world has drawn us consciously nearer to Him whom we have been desiring to serve. We pray earnestly that as He has been with us in our deliberations, so also He may be with us in all our attempts to live and to labour in the same spirit of devotion. We know that we can do nothing without Him, and we pray that that knowledge may perpetually lift our thoughts to His very self and inspire our work with the zeal and the perseverance, with the humility and the self-surrender which ever characterize His true disciples; so that we all may be able to abide in Him and to obtain His loving promise to abide in us' (pp. 31-2).

A Philadelphia paper, the *Church Standard*, has published, from 'carefully-taken notes,' 'revised by the speaker,' the addresses delivered to the Bishops by the Bishop of Lincoln at Lambeth Palace, in preparation for the Conference, and these have been reprinted in the *Church Times* of September 3 and in the *Guardian* of September 8. They are of rare beauty and spiritual force. We hope that any of our readers who have not already done so will read them throughout. But we may quote some passages which are illustrative of their general tone and emphasize the truth that the appointed work of the Church is of a spiritual character in close contact with our Lord.

¹ Reported in the *Guardian*, August 4, 1897.

'It is useful to caution some against thinking that they are living in the Spirit unless they are willing to be guided by the Church. It is needful to caution some to beware of trusting to their zeal for the Church unless they really look to Christ—to the example of His life, the reality of forgiveness through the atoning power of His death, and the power of His resurrection; to beware of thinking that they will be able to keep their hold on Christ unless they search the Scriptures with the view of coming nearer to Him, of growing in grace and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ; to beware of trusting to a mere knowledge of the Scriptures unless they set God always before them, obeying their consciences as His voice, and showing their obedience by doing their daily duty, however humble it may be.'

'New social forces have been gaining great strength in late years. My fear is that some of us have not grown proportionately in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Some of us have been so occupied in securing the reality of morals that, I fear, we do not give to Christ the place which, as Christians, we should ascribe to Him. Those who were engaged in the great work of the Oxford movement, and who spent their labour chiefly on the Scriptures and the early Fathers, seem to me to have done this better than some of us are doing now. . . . Have we . . . grown in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ anything like in proportion to the growth of our knowledge of the things of the world? If not, is there not a danger lest we should fail to see their true relation and guide aright their increasing power? . . . We might examine ourselves to see if we may hope that we are not giving way to a form of Christianity which is the outcome of the new forces in the world, nor are being tempted to repose on a morality that may free us from the inconveniences of sin and satisfy society; but that we search the Scriptures with the earnest desire to surrender ourselves, and to come to Christ, knowing that "where He is, there is safety and plenty."

'Organization does not produce life, though life may produce organization, but the secret of the power is the life. The people have seen and appreciated the beauty and the value of moral power; it is for us, as the stewards of the mysteries of God, to save them from disappointment by showing them the greater power and the higher value of the Spirit. . . . There are, thank God, many members of the great Anglican communion now who are looking to us to guide them and to lead them in the spiritual life. . . . How is this to be done? "Not by might, nor by power, but by My Spirit," saith the Lord of Hosts; not by giving way to the temptation to introduce human authority in the sphere of things that are Divine; not by putting obedience in the place of truth; not by trying to make the truth stronger or more attractive by additions of men's devising, but by handing on to the people in its purity, and, therefore, in its strength, the faith once delivered to the saints, as it has come down to us in the One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church, and as it may be proved "by most certain warrants of Holy Scripture."

Th
of the
Conf
partir
sense
these
beth
matte
work
delibe
Bisho
Conf

ΛΟΓΙ

Ι
t
(
Ι

It is
among
cover
Hunt
mend
the w
We l
much
But i
papy
that
of so
W
order
ever
about

Ι
ἀδελ
Ι
βασι
πατέ
Ι
αἰτοῖ
1
scen
p. 15
the l

These are principles which may well be applied to several of the subjects which were under the consideration of the Conference, and if the Bishop of Lincoln succeeded in imparting to some of the Bishops, or deepening in them, the high sense of the spiritual mission of the Church which pervades these Addresses, that alone would be an outcome of the Lambeth Conference of 1897 of no small value. In spite of some matters which we regret, we are not without hope that its work may have much useful result alike in the help which the deliberations themselves may have given to many of the Bishops and in the utility of the *Letter*, the resolutions of the Conference, and the reports of the Committees.

SHORT NOTICES.

ΑΟΤΙΑ ΙΗCOY. SAYINGS OF OUR LORD from an Early Greek Papyrus, discovered and edited, with Translations and Commentary by B. P. GRENFELL and A. S. HUNT. With two Plates. (Published for the Egypt Exploration Fund by Henry Frowde : London, 1897.)

It is now some few months since the rumour began to circulate among theological students that a portion of the *λόγια* had been discovered, among the latest 'finds' in Egypt, by Messrs. Grenfell and Hunt, working for the Egypt Exploration Society. With commendable speed and in a very scholarly manner, they have given to the world the fragment of papyrus on which the rumour was based. We believe that we are right in saying that out of the same find much more may be expected, which will be of interest to theologians. But it will be long, several years in fact, before the large mass of papyri acquired can be properly edited. It is not, however, likely that even within that time unanimity will be reached on the fragment of so-called *λόγια*.¹

We venture to transcribe in full the words of the fragment, in order to make our remarks on it more intelligible, and because—whatever opinion may be formed of it—there can be no two opinions about the literary interest, at any rate, of the words.¹

I. . . . καὶ τότε διαβλέψεις ἐκβαλεῖν τὸ κύριος τὸ ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου.

II. Λέγει Ἰησοῦς, εἰ μὴ ἡστεύητε τὸν κόσμον οὐ μὴ εὗρητε τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ· καὶ εἰ μὴ σαββατίσῃτε τὸ σάββατον οὐκ ὄψεσθε τὸν πατέρα.

III. Λέγει Ἰησοῦς, εἰ[σ]την ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ κόσμου καὶ ἐν σαρκὶ ὤφθην αὐτοῖς, καὶ εὖρον πάντας μεθύοντας καὶ οὐδένα εὖρον διψῶντα ἐν αὐτοῖς, καὶ

¹ That which on a first reading seems so unlike anything we have seen, is Dr. M. R. James's estimate, *Contemporary Review*, August 1897, p. 154. The letters in square brackets represent conjectural restoration; the letters with dots underneath are uncertain.

πονεῖ ἡ ψυχὴ μου ἐπὶ τοῖς υἱοῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ὅτι τυφλοὶ εἰσιν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτῶ[ν]

IV. illegible, and possibly really the lines belong to the end of the preceding λόγιον.

V. [Λέγ]ει [Ἰησοῦς ὅπ]ου ἐὰν ὦσιν [. . .] ε[. . .] . . . θεοὶ καὶ [. . .] γρ. ε[. . .] ἔστιν μόνος [. . .] γω ἐγώ εἰμι μετ' αὐτ[οῦ]· ἔγει[ρ]ον τὸν λίθον κακεῖ εὐρήσεις με, σχίσον τὸ ξύλον καὶ γὰρ ἐκεῖ εἰμι.

VI. Λέγει Ἰησοῦς οὐκ ἔστιν δεκτὸς προφήτης ἐν τῇ πατρίδι αὐτ[οῦ], οὐδὲ ἰατρὸς ποιεῖ θεραπείας εἰς τοὺς γινώσκοντας αὐτόν.

VII. Λέγει Ἰησοῦς πόλις οἰκοδομημένη ἐπ' ἄκρον ὄρους ὑψηλοῦ καὶ ἐστηριγμένη οὔτε πε[ρ]εῖν δύναται οὔτε κρυ[β]ῆναι.

VIII. is very fragmentary and uncertain, the traces of the letters being very faint.

These few words have already attracted among all scholars a great amount of attention, and a great deal of ingenuity has been expended on them; nor has the interest been limited to scholars.

First, what do we *know* about the date and origin of this fragment? It was found among a number of papyri 'ranging in date from the first to the eighth century, and embracing every variety of subject,' on the site of Oxyrhynchus, one of the chief centres of early Christianity in Egypt, situated some 120 miles south of Cairo. As to the date, this is determined partly by the fact that it was found 'in a mound which produced a great number of papyri belonging to the first three centuries of our era,' but still more by the character of the handwriting. This does not fix the date very precisely, but the editors are of opinion—and it is entirely a question for experts—that 'the hand of the Logia fragment is far from belonging to the latest type of uncials used before 300 A.D., and that therefore the papyrus was probably written not much later than the year 200.'

Next, we ask of what is it a fragment? One side of the leaf is numbered 11, so that it was preceded by ten leaves containing no doubt the same kind of 'sayings' all through, for, as Dr. James points out, 'ten leaves of the size of ours would not contain any important writing to which this could be an appendix.' The complete work was then no doubt a collection of sayings made for some purpose. As to what the purpose was, various conjectures have been hazarded. Some have thought the work was intended as a manual for inquirers about Christianity; another suggestion is that it is a hortatory work by an ascetic of the Thebaid, which would fit in well with the important part played by Oxyrhynchus in the history of Egyptian monasticism.¹ Another ingenious, but improbable, suggestion is that we have here part of a supposed indictment made against our Lord at His trial.² The use of the present tense is rather against this last theory. We are inclined to regard it as a collection based partly on canonical sources and partly on one or more well-known un-canonical works made during the second century. Professor Harnack maintains—basing his arguments on the character of

¹ See Ruffinus, *Hist. Monach.* cv., quoted by Dr. Swete in the *Expository Times* for September.

² See the article in the *Expositor*, September 1897, by the Rev. H. A. Redpath.

the sayings—that they are excerpts from the *Gospel of the Egyptians*. There is no doubt that there were some sayings of our Lord known to the earliest Christians, including the Evangelists, which the latter, not intending to record every saying of our Lord, did not include. Subsequent generations would make every effort to recover and preserve these, and with the false would no doubt secure many that were genuine. There can be little doubt that some preserved in the leaf before us *may* very well have been actual sayings of Christ, while others seem to us to be either reminiscences of words recorded in the Canonical Gospels, often brought together from different parts of them, or to be glosses on the record of the Canonical Gospels. It would be rash and unscholarly to dogmatize as to what these sayings must or must not be. Many of those who have ventured to write about them have been very careful not to make any pronouncement *ex cathedra*. It may also be a useful reminder to point out that even when parallels of thought and diction have been produced the matter is not settled, for the further question has to be considered, which is prior—the λόγιον or the parallel? Again, the parallel may be actually misleading if the sayings or ideas regarded as parallel are so familiar that they may have been reached independently. We venture to think that Professor Rendel Harris, writing on this fragment in the September number of the *Contemporary Review*, has with characteristic impetuosity gone beyond his facts in urging that these λόγια (1) go behind our Canonical Gospels, (2) show that the earliest quotations of the Canonical Gospels owe their deviations from the texts of them preserved in manuscripts to the use of such uncanonical collections of sayings. If Clement of Rome and Clement of Alexandria both have the same deviations from the Canonical Gospels, this is capable of being explained in various ways, not only in the one Professor Rendel Harris chooses to adopt. His *may* be the right explanation of the phenomena, but is not necessarily so.

Having given the λόγια in full, we do not intend to go through them *seriatim*, but will content ourselves with pointing out some of the interesting questions that have been raised. Those of our readers who are familiar with their Greek Testament will have no difficulty in recognizing the points which the λόγια have in common with the Synoptists and with St. John. The first, which is not complete, need not detain us. In regard to the second the following points have been raised: Firstly, here and elsewhere, we have to consider the force of the present λέγει, when from many points of view a past tense would have been more obvious. It may not be very different in force from St. Paul's use in Gal. iv. 30: τί λέγει ἡ γραφή; or Rom. xi. 4: τί λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ χρηματισμός; or in Eph. iv. 8, v. 14. It is not an unimportant point, and may throw light on the purpose for which the collection was made. It seems to suggest that the passages are taken from some other work, for we can hardly conceive their being put together in this form for the first time. So that on this, among other grounds, we should be opposed to the view that we have here part of a collection of sayings which itself

formed one of the sources of our Gospels. Secondly, much discussion has gathered round the interpretation of this second λόγιον. Of course if it be interpreted literally of fasting and keeping the Sabbath, the words cannot have been our Lord's, for insistence on these in the literal sense for their own sake is against the whole spirit of His teaching. We have no hesitation, however (though here we run counter to the editors), in taking the words with a spiritual meaning of the *true* fast and the *true* Sabbath-keeping. There are abundant parallels to such an interpretation, and a parallel has been quoted even to the actual collocation of the spiritual fast and the spiritual Sabbath. Indeed Is. lviii. would be a sufficient reference.¹ Thirdly, the actual expression *νηστεύειν τὸν κόσμον* must be admitted to be a great difficulty. Various emendations, for the most part unlikely, have been suggested. The actual expression *οἱ τοῦ κόσμου νηστεύοντες* is found in a very useful parallel from Clement of Alexandria, given by Dr. Lock in the *Guardian* (August 11, 1897), and if any emendation is required that seems the simplest. If the accusative be kept we prefer to regard it as an accusative of *respect* rather than of *duration of time*.

In regard to the third λόγιον, the first point to notice is that by the use of the past tenses *ἔστην*, *ᾤφθην*, our Lord is made to look back on His work as past, and so some have regarded it as placed in the time after the Resurrection. This does not seem necessary, as it might have been used towards the end of His ministry with a retrospect much like the *ποσάκις ἠθέλησα ἐπισυναγαγείν τὰ τέκνα σου* (Matt. xxiii. 37; Luke xiii. 34), the spirit of regret in which is very similar. This one instance—which be it remembered St. Luke puts much earlier in our Lord's ministry than St. Matthew does—is quite sufficient to dispose of the necessity of placing the words after the Resurrection. Moreover the past tenses are quite sufficiently explained on the supposition that a quotation from Baruch iii. 38 (*μετὰ τοῦτο ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ᾤφθην καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις συνανέστράφη*) has been here adapted.

The fourth λόγιον we may pass over, merely noticing that Dr. Swete regards the lines as really part of the third, and would fill the illegible *lacuna* καὶ [οὐ] βλέ[πουν] οἱδὲ γινώσκουσιν ἑαυτῶν τ[ὴν] πτωχείαν, which is not an improbable restoration, though that is all which can be said.

The fifth shares with the second the greater part of the discussion which the fragment has received. The beginning is in large measure illegible, but seems to be an assertion of Christ's presence with the solitary believer struggling amid unfavourable circumstances of some kind. The second part was that which naturally attracted attention. If one interpretation of the second λόγιον led those who held it to regard the collection as coming from a Judaistic source, so in the same way one or two possible interpretations which found favour here undoubtedly pointed to some Gnostic, mystic, or pantheistic

¹ In regard to this, and indeed on the whole subject, we should like to refer our readers to the excellent account of the *λόγια* given by Dr. Swete in a lecture to the gathering of clergy at Cambridge on July 29, and printed in the *Expository Times* of September.

sect. The scholarly caution of Dr. James is manifest here, and after mentioning three possible interpretations he himself inclines to that which seems to us beyond all question established by a reference of which he was probably unaware when he wrote his article. Dr. James writes :

‘It seems to me that there are three possible lines of interpretation for this : (1) Christ is everywhere and in everything. . . . (2) The emphasis is to be laid upon the hard and laborious character of the acts prescribed—the heaving up of the stone, and the cleaving of the wood. . . . Effort is necessary if the knowledge of Christ is to be won. (3) The “stone” and “the wood” may just possibly be the important factors in the saying. Both of them are familiar types of the Lord’ (*l. c.* p. 159).

Now of these Dr. James prefers the second, and though we have given all three—all, we believe, which have been suggested—we have no doubt that the second is nearest to the right explanation, though its force is not quite what Dr. James imagined. The expression receives its interpretation from a passage in the Septuagint version of Ecclesiastes x. 9, a passage quoted independently by Dr. Swete (in the lecture to which reference has been made) and by Professor Harnack,¹ whose attention was drawn to it by Dr. Lisco. We venture to quote the interpretation in Dr. Swete’s well-chosen words :

‘In Eccl. x. 9 we read :

ἐξαιρων λίθους διαπονηθήσεται ἐν αὐτοῖς·
σχίζων ξύλα κινδυνεύσει ἐν αὐτοῖς.

The writer is dealing with the toils and dangers inherent in the arts of life, which are minimised by the gifts of wisdom. In building, the raising of the great blocks, of which the temple or palace is constructed, is a work of much labour; the cleaving of the timber a work of peril. The Lord, if this *logion* be really His, adapts the saying of Koheleth to the circumstances connected with the spiritual building of His Church. His apostles scattered over the world, alone among unbelievers, would incur much hard labour and many perils. But it was just in such toilsome and dangerous work that they might expect the promised Presence of Christ. “Raise the stone, do the uphill work of the religious pioneer, and thou shalt find Me. Cleave the timber, face the danger that lies in the way of duty, and there am I.” The Wisdom of God (Eccl. x. 10) pledges Himself to be with the Christian Builder, and never more so than when he builds alone, and with labour and peril. There is a true Christian *Gnosis* here, but no Gnosticism. It is a saying full of practical importance to the first generation, and one which may help us in the work of to-day’ (*l. c.* p. 548).

The exegesis of this passage illustrates how simple sometimes is the real explanation, while till that is forthcoming the more abstruse ones are evenly balanced.

Of the remaining *λόγια* we do not propose to speak. Two of them are related to passages in the Canonical Gospels, from which, however, they depart widely in certain details. They may both be ‘inexact reports of a canonical saying.’ Of the last so little remains that no connected sense is possible without almost wholesale restora-

¹ *Ueber die jüngst entdeckten Sprüche Jesu*, p. 19.

tion. Instead of going into *minutiae*, which might be uninteresting and wearisome to our readers, we have preferred to give the text of the whole, and then to report the progress made in regard to the investigation of some of the greater difficulties of interpretation. Whether all the sayings, or any of them, have the genuine ring of the Canonical Gospels, must be a matter for individual opinion. We think the editors made a mistake in using the term *λόγια*, seeing that it has its own associations, and it is only by great assumptions that this fragment can share those associations. In any case we see no evidence that we have here anything which takes us 'behind the Gospels' of the New Testament; even if we accept, as for their beauty we should like to do, some of these so-called 'sayings of Jesus' as genuine. At present we prefer to wait for more light, which may come to us even from this same 'find.' We will conclude by a warning against the careless use of language in regard to these and similar discoveries, which may tend to detract from the authority of the Bible by hastily giving a false position of authority to illegitimate claimants.

The Book of the Secrets of Enoch, translated from the Slavonic. By W. R. MORFILL, M.A., and edited with Introduction, Notes, and Indices, by R. H. CHARLES, M.A. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1896.)

The work here published is interesting in several ways. In the first place it is interesting in itself, as a new contribution to the fast accumulating store of Apocalyptic literature. In the second place, it is deserving of notice on account of the way in which English students have been made acquainted with it. In the *Jahrb. f. Prot. Theol.* (1892) appeared an article on Russian Pseudepigraphic Literature, which stated that there was a Slavonic version of the Book of Enoch, a book which had so far been known only through the Ethiopic version. Further investigation showed that this opinion was wrong, and that the work mentioned was really quite a distinct treatise, containing moreover material (as the learned Introduction to this volume tells us) which explains some allusions to Enoch which could not be identified from the Ethiopic version, as, for example, the reference in Origen (ed. Lommatzsch), xxi. 59. The interest of the work Mr. Charles, with his very wide knowledge of this class of literature, was not slow to perceive, when the translation of it had been furnished by Mr. Morfill, the learned pioneer of Slavonic studies in England. The edition before us only anticipated by a very short time the translation of the same work into German, published by M. Bonwetsch in Berlin, so that the English scholars have the credit, and the difficulties, of the *editio princeps*. The methods of the two editions vary somewhat, the English giving a translation with variant readings in an *apparatus criticus*, and very full illustrations of the thought or expression from other similar literature and elsewhere. Professor Bonwetsch has contented himself with a short Introduction, based in large measure on that of Mr. Charles, and a translation of the two main recensions of the Slavonic (for it is found in a longer and a shorter

form.
The
been
At th
refra
Prof
in hi
feren
place
two
who
othe
pres
whic
accu

In t
Eth
the
Eno
the
her
'be
som
det
Thi
and
fin
this
Lu
the
saki
thi
acc
mo
tio
arc
pri
em
it
da
siv
th
sh
oth
C

cu
an

form), which are printed in full, the shorter underneath the longer. The work of translation, for which Mr. Morfill is responsible, has been by no means easy, and scholars are much indebted to him for it. At the present stage of Slavonic studies in England he has wisely refrained from introducing the various readings of the original. These Professor Bonwetsch has given us, and he has also been more free in his emendations. Sometimes, as in the title to chap. ix., the difference of the two translators is due to a different interpretation being placed on an abbreviation in the Slavonic. We have compared the two translations over a limited extent, and the agreement is on the whole as close as one could expect, closer in some passages than in others. We will not delay longer over the translation, except to express the hope that this may be the precursor of many volumes in which the studies of learned Russians, and the materials they are accumulating, may be placed at the service of English scholars.

Let us turn to the interesting points raised by the volume itself. In the first place, Mr. Charles is of opinion that it is later than the Ethiopic Enoch, even in its latest form, thus (p. xxv) 'we observe the same advanced view on Demonology appearing in the Slavonic Enoch, and in the latest interpolation in the Ethiopic Enoch,' and the 'conceptions and phraseology of that book' are reproduced here. The question of date is settled by the assignment of a date 'between 30 B.C. and the Christian era' as the superior limit, and some date earlier than A.D. 70 as an inferior limit. These dates are determined by the references to other literature found in this book. This is a matter on which there will always be differences of opinion, and we do not invariably agree with Mr. Charles in the evidence he finds of resemblance. Thus we do not feel satisfied as to the use of this book in the Epistle of Barnabas. Again, the reference to St. Luke vi. 35 *μηδὲν ἀπελπίζοντες* is not established by a reference to the words, 'Blessed is he who executes a just judgment not for the sake of recompense, but for the sake of righteousness, *expecting nothing in return.*' If we had the exact words in Greek we should accept a reference to St. Luke, but nothing less is sufficient. One more criticism we have to make, and that is in regard to the translation (p. xxiii) of a passage from the Testaments of the XII Patriarchs. The passage, from Levi 3, has to do with the angels imprisoned in the second heaven: *ἐν αὐτῷ εἰσὶ πάντα τὰ πνεύματα τῶν ἐπαγωγῶν εἰς ἐκδίκησιν τῶν ἀνόμων.* This Mr. Charles translates, 'In it are all the spirits of the lawless ones who are kept bound unto the day of vengeance.' Such a translation of *τῶν ἐπαγωγῶν* with a passive meaning seems unparalleled, and does not find any support in the meaning of words of similar formation such as *δουλαγωγός*. We should prefer to render, 'In it are all the spirits of those who lead others off to the punishment reserved for the lawless.' In that case there may be a reference to such angels as are referred to by Mr. Charles in his note on page 10.

There are many points which are fanciful in the writer's views on creation, the *millennium*, and similar subjects; but even these have an interest for those who wish to trace the development of religious

thought. We have been especially interested in the pages in which Mr. Charles summarizes the history of the belief in the seven heavens. The belief in a plurality of heavens, implied in such expressions as the 'kingdom of the heavens,' and in St. Paul's reference to the 'third heaven'—to say nothing of such expressions in the Epistle to the Hebrews as 'passed through the heavens,' and 'into heaven itself'—is traced back to the Babylonians.

'That ancient Judaism was not unaffected by such views we may reasonably conclude from certain passages in the Old Testament. . . . Such phrases as "the heaven of heavens" . . . cannot be adequately interpreted unless in reference to such a belief. . . . The presence of evil in heaven [cf. Job i. 6, 7; 1 Kings xxii. 19 *sqq.*], though offensive to the conscience of later times, seems to have caused no offence in early Semitic thought' (p. xxxiv). . . . 'Though the Talmudic description of the seven heavens is puerile in the extreme, its character attests the influence of a growing ethical consciousness' (p. xxxix).

Mr. Charles then goes on to point out how traces of these earlier views are found in the language of the New Testament, some expressions in which (*e.g.* Eph. vi. 12) seem to imply 'the presence of evil in some parts of the heavens,' and how the old Semitic doctrine of the seven heavens really 'presupposing in some respects dualistic influences could not hold its own in a monistic faith'; in other words, how the graduation of evil, with its separate divisions of heaven, made way for the Christian conception that into heaven nothing that offends against the idea of holiness and purity can enter. It is impossible in short extracts to do justice to the way in which Mr. Charles has brought together the evidence bearing on this point. On many other similar points, too, there is in his notes a wealth of illustration of varying degrees of value and interest. At the present time this class of literature is the subject of revived attention, and exaggerated importance may very easily be attached to it, but there can be no doubt that it is a great gain to the theological student to have access, for purposes of reference, to editions of these books so carefully edited and illustrated as the one we have been noticing.

A Concordance to the Septuagint, and the other Greek Versions of the Old Testament. By the late EDWIN HATCH, M.A., D.D., and HENRY A. REDPATH, M.A. Parts V. and VI. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1896-7.)

WITH the appearance of Part VI., the *Concordance* is completed, and to this part is appended a list of *addenda et corrigenda* for the whole work. That the list is so long was inevitable in a work involving such a vast number of references, and the proportion they bear to the whole must be infinitesimal. In part, moreover, it is due to the fact that during the time the work has been in hand, the exact texts of the manuscripts quoted have become better known through the publication of photographic representations of the manuscripts. Thus the *Codex Marchalianus*, and still more lately the *Codex Sarravianus*, are now accessible in reproductions by photography. The former has been used by Dr. Swete, and from it have been obtained a

num
Pitra
All t
place
are c
Conc
the t
frag
in th
cove
trans
with
A
will
mish
lishe
LXX
We
catic
one,
cont
inve
born
are
the
that
mor
exp
Som
TH
for
trib
Rev
to t
Int
tab
(pp
vi)
the
poi
use
WI
Ve
the
of
wo
pro

number of words used by Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion. Pitra also, in his *Spicilegium Solesmense*, collected a number more. All these, so far as possible, have been incorporated in their proper place in the *Concordance*, and those which could not be so recorded are collected at the end of the *corrigenda*; so that we may say the *Concordance* is as complete as existing materials would allow. But all the time fresh material is accumulating, such, for example, as the fragment of the *Hexapla* which Dr. Mercati found on a palimpsest in the library at Milan; and since then we have to record the discovery of what may be only the first instalment of a part of Aquila's translation as used in the Synagogue. This last is to be published with little delay.

Anyone who has used the successive parts as they have come out will be glad to feel that in considering any word he need now have no misgiving as to whether it is in the part which has already been published, or not. Students of the New Testament, as well as students of the LXX, know full well the indispensable character of this *Concordance*. We do not hesitate to describe it as one of the most valuable publications in connexion with theology which has lately appeared, and one, too, which will be of permanent value. The material which it contains must be the foundation on which all lexical and grammatical investigations of the LXX must be laid. To its accuracy we have borne repeated testimony. Mr. Redpath and the Clarendon Press are both to be congratulated on the rapid and thorough way in which the work has been accomplished; and it is no exaggeration to say that they have produced a work the value of which will be more and more obvious as time goes on, and one for which we venture to express the gratitude of theological students in general.

Some Lessons of the Revised Version of the New Testament. By the Right Rev. BROOKE FOSS WESTCOTT, D.D., D.C.L., Lord Bishop of Durham. (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1897.)

THESE chapters have been collected and enlarged from the *Expositor* for 1887, and have been issued 'in the hope that they may contribute to a fuller understanding of the aim and character of the Revised Version of the New Testament, and lead English readers to the systematic study of it' (Preface). The volume consists of an Introduction (pp. 1-30) and seven chapters (pp. 31-222), with a full table of Contents (pp. ix-xv), and an Index of Scripture References (pp. 223-39). The Bishop draws attention in his short Preface (p. vi) to the questionable statement which appears on the title-page of the A. V. of 1611, viz. 'Appointed to be read in Churches,' and points out how the Genevan and Bishops' Bibles continued to be used long after the publication of the so-called 'Authorized Version.' What he has said would seem to justify the reading of the Revised Version in the Church Services, if it were thought desirable, equally with the translation made in King James's reign, without any infringement of the rules of the Prayer Book. The A. V. of 1611 slowly won its way into public favour by its own merits, and has indeed the prescription of long usage and the prestige of being adopted by the

Savoy Conference as the text of the Epistles and Gospels in the Book of Common Prayer, but that it had any other authorization, such as the Bishops' Bible had, is certainly open to doubt. It is not our purpose to advocate the use of the Revised New Testament for reading in Divine Service, because, in spite of all that Bishop Westcott has so ably urged in these chapters in favour of the Revisers' work, we are bound to consider the interests, not of the scholar merely, but of the plain man, the ordinary worshipper; and we are convinced that the advantage of having the more accurate (sometimes too painfully accurate) translation of the original will be more than outweighed by the loss of that general sense of Holy Scripture which is acquired by hearing the familiar rhythm of the English Bible. The Revisers claim (says the Bishop) to 'have placed the English reader far more nearly than before in the position of the Greek scholar' (p. 4), but, while acknowledging with gratitude 'this endeavour after faithfulness' (p. 5), and 'this reverent freedom' in treating the Bible 'like any other book' (p. 6), we feel obliged to take up the cause of 'the unlearned' worshipper, and ask whether he will be edified by this nicety of tenses, this distinction between prepositions, and this uniform insistence upon the article. The Revised New Testament is a great gain to the scholar, to the clergyman, to the student, and to any to whom the Greek text is familiar, and such persons, if they will read carefully these chapters, will be thoroughly rewarded, and learn from them many new things; but the English readers, with very rare exceptions, cannot appreciate the value of the changes which have been made in the translation, and when such a one attempts to go through the various improvements which the Bishop points out, he will often ask himself, Was not this or that passage just as intelligible to me before as it is now? We have tried to put ourselves into the position of the ordinary member of a congregation—that is, one who has not the wit to understand the whys and wherefores of the Revised Version; and we are convinced that the clergy will do well not to force on the reading of the Revised New Testament in the congregation—at any rate, not in its present form. Of the new translation of the Old Testament we might be inclined to think otherwise, but that is not the question before us. Bishop Westcott's volume is strongly to be recommended to the younger clergy and theological students; they will learn from it much that concerns Christian doctrine, as well as the way to make a minute study of the Greek text. The two chapters, for example, dealing with the Christian Life (ch. v) and Creation, Providence, and the Person of the Lord (ch. vi), and the light thrown upon them by a more accurate rendering of Greek words and phrases, are particularly valuable; while to have studied the force of the aorist and imperfect tenses and the exact meaning of prepositions and particles (ch. i) will contribute greatly to accuracy and clearness in the explication of Christian doctrine.

We cannot always agree with the Bishop's commendations of the Revisers' work—e.g. in 1 Cor. ix. 27, 'I buffet my body and bring it into bondage: lest by any means . . . I myself should be rejected.'

We
by th
and,
from
by th
unde
by 'I
again
'repr
'repr
a uni

V
"tes
and
sever
have
rend
The
passa
18)
usele
to co
in ve
fusio

V
upon
xxvii
by th
used
to th
204,

Libe

WE
for i
and
follo
calcu
in K
inter
for
to th
and
tone
of th
e.g.
and
. V

We do not think that the English reader has gained anything here by the restoration of 'the vigour of St. Paul's language' (p. 133); and, certainly, the student has lost considerably, for the rare word *ἰστωπύλειν* (which occurs also in St. Luke xviii. 5, where it is rendered by the Revisers 'wear me out') was fairly well represented by 'keep under,' the idea being that of self-discipline; nothing, too, is gained by 'bondage' for 'subjection'; and the word *ἀδόκιμος* (which occurs again twice in 2 Cor. xiii. 5, 6) should have been uniformly rendered 'reprobate' in both places, instead of 'rejected' in the one and 'reprobate' in the other. The A. V. never professed to maintain a uniformity of rendering, but the Revisers do (pp. 68-9).

We are surprised that the Bishop, after saying that 'the very word "testament" itself misrepresents the Divine relation to men' (p. 143), and showing the advantage of rendering *διαθήκη* by 'covenant' in several passages, should have omitted to mention that the Revisers have done nothing to remedy the hopeless mess caused by the two renderings, 'covenant' and 'testament,' in Hebrews ix. 15-18. The A. V. was consistent in keeping 'testament' throughout the passage, the Revisers alternate between 'covenant' (verses 15 and 18) and 'testament' (verses 16 and 17). The marginal note is useless under the circumstances, for it looks as if the Revisers had to come to a compromise because of certain difficulties of translation in verses 16 and 17. To the scholar the R. V. causes only confusion, to the English reader the A. V. was at least intelligible.

We will conclude by thanking the Bishop of Durham for insisting upon such doctrinal points as (i.) the connexion of *εἰς* in St. Matt. xxviii. 19 with St. Paul's frequent use of *ἐν Χριστῷ*, now made clearer by the Revisers (pp. 63, 170); and (ii.) the force of the name 'Jesus' used alone, according to the Revisers' text, especially in the Epistle to the Hebrews, as emphasizing the true humanity of our Lord (pp. 204, 205).

Libellus Precum ad usum Cleri Anglicani idoneus. Salva Ecclesiæ Catholicæ fide collegit et edidit Presbyter de Ordine Pastoralis Spiritus Sancti. (London: John Hodges, 1897.)

WE welcome this little book of devotions for the use of the clergy, for it will meet a real want. It is well got up and clearly printed, and the arrangement is simple and convenient. After the Calendar follow Morning and Evening Prayers for each day of the week, calculated to occupy about half an hour each time, and alternately in English and Latin; then come suggestions for midday prayer, intercession and study, and a useful office, founded upon the Ordinal, for Ember-tide; an Address delivered by the Archbishop of York to the Pastoral Order at Whitsuntide, 1896, upon the 'Priestly Life,' and a short supplement for special days, complete the volume. The tone of the compilation is thoroughly Catholic and after the mind of the English Church. Materials have been gathered from all sides, e.g. from such representative English Churchmen as Bede, Alcuin, and Anselm, Andrewes, Laud, Cosin, and Wilson, besides the Greek

VOL. XLV.—NO. LXXXIX.

Q

and Latin Fathers, the Ancient Liturgies and Sacramentaries, and the Book of Common Prayer, and the 'de Imitatione Christi.'

In a few points we feel bound to disagree with the compiler's work, and we trust that in a second edition he may see his way to adopt our suggestions :

1. Why was not the Prayer-Book Calendar used instead of one which contains Saints' Days and Octaves unknown to English Churchmen in their authorized formularies?

2. Why should not the source of each Prayer, English or Latin, have been uniformly noted, whether an adaptation or not?

3. Why should the Revised Version of the Psalms have been preferred to Bishop Coverdale's translation, with which the clergy are familiar?

4. When a devotional writer, like Bishop Andrewes, is made use of, or when the Revised Version is employed, why should not the quotations be exact, and all interpolations or changes in the text be marked?

5. Will not the compiler add a full list of the books referred to? 'See Bp Barry' (p. 4) is hardly intelligible.

The whole volume needs also careful revision as to punctuation, and, in particular, wherever the Revised Version is used, the spelling, the italics, and other features of it ought not to be ignored. We dislike, too, such a direction as '*stand at prie dieu*' (*passim*), because it savours of fussiness, and we think that it would have been enough to recommend the use of Avancini's *Meditations*, without breaking the course of the offices by frequent reference to them. We recommend also that the Psalms be collected together at the end of the volume to avoid the cross-references. Two errors must be noticed, viz. (1) in Psalm liv. 4 'the Lord' is the reading of the R. V. because the Hebrew name there is not 'Jehovah,' as it is in verse 6 : it is wrong therefore to print 'the LORD'; (2) in Psalm cxix. 5 the R. V. has rightly put 'Oh' (p. 4) before 'that,' whereas this volume has 'O' (p. 32). Such blemishes suggest that careful revision is needed before a second edition of this helpful little book is issued.

The New Life in Christ: a Study in Personal Religion. By JOSEPH AGAR BEET, D.D. (London : Hodder and Stoughton, 1895.)

THE present volume is the second in a series of theological works by this writer. He has already given us *Through Christ to God*, and he promises us a further volume, to be called *The Church of Christ* (p. 217), in which he proposes to discuss more fully many topics which he has touched upon here, e.g. the Means of Grace. He writes, as he tells us, 'for Christian pastors' and 'Christian workers,' both men and women.¹ The table of contents is very elaborate; it shows that the book deals with the Ruin and Restoration of Man, the Way of Holiness, the Divine and Human in the Christian Life, and the Revelation of God in the New Life in Christ. There are thirty-seven lectures in all, and they give one the impression that they

¹ Preface, p. vii.

were not written with due relation to each other, or they would have been easily condensed, and that with great advantage, for they are spun out unnecessarily; their arrangement is unsystematic, they lack careful analysis, and the literary style is weak. There are indications of fair scholarship, but it is unwise, except in very special cases, to give original translations of the Greek of the New Testament; for, more often than not, Dr. Beet's renderings are bald and unrhythmical, and occasionally erroneous, e.g. 'the love which God has *about* us,'¹ 'baptising them *for* the name,'² where the prepositions *ἐν* and *εἰς*, to say the least, have suffered violence. In doctrinal matters Dr. Beet holds the position of an orthodox dissenter. His teaching upon the Holy Trinity³ and the Incarnation⁴ are thoroughly good, though we are inclined to think that he does not understand St. Paul's doctrine of the 'Spirit,'⁵ being misled by the use of the definite article before πνεῦμα, and he cannot appreciate the Personality of the Spirit because of the neuter word in the Greek, and his idea of the 'Paraclete' is very inadequate (pp. 304-5). He is excellent upon subjects like Freewill (pp. 15, 16), Original Sin (p. 26), and Adoption (pp. 50-71), although he makes out that St. Paul's teaching upon this latter point is 'forensic,' and contrasts with it the teaching of the Catholic Epistles (pp. 89-90). He is terribly afraid of Catholic doctrine; the Sacraments are kept almost out of sight; he will not connect 'holiness' (p. 99) with the Baptismal condition; he says next to nothing about the effect of Baptism, though he allows that it puts men into some relation with God (p. 52; comp. pp. 84, 85, 88). We look in vain for any recognition of the need of Repentance, except as a first step in conversion;⁶ and, while the doctrine of Assurance is moderately stated,⁷ we dislike the argument for justification from the sense of inward peace because of its tendency to self-deception and hypocrisy. We should have expected Prayer to be well treated of, but for one who has so imperfect an idea of Christ's perpetual intercession (pp. 226-7) even this means of grace is constrained; and we were surprised to find that a writer who spoke of 'Churches' (p. 280) regarded 'the Church' as 'a divinely ordained Society' (p. 229). We shall look for clearer teaching upon this subject in the promised volume (pp. 217, 229). Quite the best thing in this truly earnest but somewhat unattractive book is the comment upon the disadvantage which Unitarianism offers in personal religion when compared with the orthodox doctrine of the Three in One. Dr. Beet says:

'It is now evident that, just as God created the world through the agency of the Son and the Spirit, so through them He now comes near and reveals Himself to His intelligent creatures. Thus within the God-head are avenues of God's self-manifestation, and of approach of God to man and of man to God. But between a unipersonal God and His creatures would be an infinite gulf across which they could scarcely hear His voice or see His face. He would be little more than a distant

¹ 1 St. John iv. 16.² St. Matthew xxviii. 19.³ Lectures xxxii-xxxv.⁴ Lecture xv.⁵ Lecture ii.⁶ Lecture vii.⁷ Lecture x.

abstraction. And such is God to-day to most who deny the divinity of Christ. They are further from God than are the Psalmists of the Old Testament. For Israel's intercourse with God was greatly strengthened by hopes of a fuller revelation to come. But to thousands of busy men and women to-day the vision of the eternal Son incarnate for their salvation, and the felt presence in their hearts of a divine Helper personally distinct from the Father into whose presence He leads them and from the Son whose face He reveals to them, afford an intercourse with God to them otherwise impossible and unconceivable' (pp. 321-2).

Studies in Hebrew Proper Names. By G. BUCHANAN GRAY, M.A., Lecturer in Hebrew and Old Testament Theology in Mansfield College, late Senior Kennicott Scholar in the University of Oxford. (London: A. and C. Black, 1896.)

THIS careful and painstaking work is the outcome of 'an essay written for the Senior Kennicott Scholarship' at Oxford in the year 1893. Its production is worthy of its publishers as well as of its author, for we do not remember noticing any typographical errors of importance. It is a work which must have involved immense labour, very often dealing with what one cannot but call uninteresting details. Even if we do not agree with many of the conclusions of the author, there is much to be learnt from his presentment of the facts, apart from the arguments he bases upon them. That Hebrew names are in many cases, especially in the early stages of Biblical history, significant we suppose may be taken for granted. From the time when Seth received his name (Gen. iv. 25) and onwards names were given with distinct reference to surrounding circumstances. In some cases this name may have been given from similarity of sound, and not necessarily on strictly philological principles, but the connexion was implied or expressed in no doubtful terms. The study of Hebrew proper names, then, with their meaning, their origin, and their classification, cannot be looked upon simply as a dry-as-dust branch of inquiry, but is one full of interest to the Biblical scholar who looks below the surface. Others before Mr. Gray have pursued the study—notably St. Jerome in early times in his two treatises on Proper Names, and in modern times Nestle in his *Die Israelitischen Eigennamen nach ihrer Religionsgeschichtlichen Bedeutung* (Haarlem, 1876), and Lagarde. And as archæology has pursued its investigations, the inscriptions that have been brought to light with the names inscribed in them illustrate the forms and origin of many names. In studying this volume, written more or less from the point of view of what is called the higher criticism, though very temperately expressed, one or two cautions are required. (1) There is a little risk of the old fallacy of the argument in a circle. Arrange your authorities in the order accepted by the school of Biblical critics with whom you agree; go through the details of your work on this system. The results accord with the arrangement. Therefore the arrangement is the right one.¹ Now we do not say that Mr. Gray has intentionally

¹ This mode of argument is not peculiar to any particular school of critics.

argued
his w
other
How
Here,
of fig
immem
would
insert
the p
consci
would
would
For in
dating
names
with
are so
(1) th
the p
could
had g
showi
Old T
An
proces
expres
section
or tw
means
reason
shoul
suppor
from
this r
names
us un
not st
For
conta
Baal
name
Jehov
cases
away
T
carry
1
2
heath

argued in this way ; but the impression left on our minds by parts of his work is that he has gone perilously near doing so. (2) The other thought that is suggested to us by a perusal of this work is : How true it is that statistics may be handled so as to prove anything. Here, again, we do not blame Mr. Gray for his statistics. His tables of figures are somewhat complicated, though worked out with immense conscientiousness—*e.g.* he always specifies when the figures would be different if a doubtful or uncertain name were omitted or inserted. They are likely to be of great service, but in dealing with the proper names of the Bible other factors should be taken into consideration. It would be an interesting work, though one which would involve a great expenditure of time, to see how the figures would work out if the names were classified on some different system. For instance, such tables, if arranged on the basis of the traditional dating of the Books of the Old Testament, might prove that certain names now assigned to particular periods of Jewish history occurred with greater frequency at other times. As it is, Mr. Gray's tables are some of them necessarily complicated by having to deal with (1) the supposed date of the particular book; (2) the date to which the persons named in it have to be referred. This, we suppose, could not be helped. But we should have been glad if Mr. Gray had given us a classified list of the writings of the Old Testament, showing in which of his three divisions he placed any book of the Old Testament he had occasion to refer to.

After stating the method and limits of his inquiry, Mr. Gray proceeds to deal first with the names in which one term of the name expresses relationship. Following upon this comes a very interesting section on Animal Names. We rather demur to the insertion of one or two of these names—*e.g.* Seirah (Judg. iii. 26), which probably means 'the bushy place,' and Levi. At the same time, there is no reason why the name Kore (1 Chron. xxvi. 1 : *i.e.* a partridge) should be excluded. These animal names have been adduced to support the belief in the survival of superstitious practices derived from totem belief and totem organization. It is needless to say that this no more convicts the Israelites of totemism than the fact of names such as Fox or Wolf existing among ourselves would bring us under the charge. Mr. Gray of course sees this, though he does not state the case strongly enough.¹

Following this section there is a discussion of the names which contain an element denoting dominion. In the case of the name Baal much discussion has arisen. Is the name Baal the personal name of a God? and is the deity referred to under the name Baal Jehovah or some other deity?² If the former view is right, then some cases in which idolatry might be charged to Israel would be done away with. Mr. Gray handles this part of his work with great skill.

The argument laid down in the following sentence will not surely carry conviction of certainty to every mind :

¹ It is noteworthy that a large proportion of these names are foreign.

² In putting the question thus, I do not mean that there were no heathen Baals.

'Where we are dealing with a considerable number [*i.e.* of proper names] we may safely argue on the supposition that the *order* of reference in literature corresponds on the average to the order of occurrence in actual life; and also that the date to which they are first referred in literature represents approximately the date at which they actually first came into use' (p. 161).

It is when we reach the part of Mr. Gray's book dealing with the names in Chronicles that we feel least *en rapport* with him. He begins by saying: 'I hope to prove conclusively that *these names largely consist of those of the compiler's own time* (c. 300 B.C.); *that they are at least not genuine survivals from the days of David and the subsequent kings.*' It is here, to begin with, that we think his arguments are weakest, and that he approaches very closely to, if he does not actually use, the argument in a circle. Besides, how far is it possible to imagine that, in the days of the Chronicler, a compiler of tables of names such as those in the first book would ever conceive the idea of foisting in names of persons into a period unacquainted with such names? Does not such an argument as the following carry conviction with it and go against his main thesis, that because '*certain lists . . . exactly or closely correspond in character with post-Exilic lists, the more probable does it become that many of the residue of the names are not post-Exilic, but, presumably, actual names of the period to which they are referred*' (p. 189)? The data given seem by no means sufficient to establish such a statement as the following: 'The systematic lists of tribal princes, etc., found in P are valueless as records of the Mosaic age' (p. 209); for the author himself goes on indeed to allow that they are old in that he says: 'The names are in part drawn from earlier sources (J E, D) still extant, in part from earlier sources now lost,' though he is obliged for the sake of his theory to add that 'to complete the lists some and probably several names created *ad hoc* or chosen from current names had to be included.' Why in the world are we bound to assume this? Mr. Gray rejects (p. 228) certain Levitical genealogies as worthless because of the character of the names included in them, though it is just as arguable that in the case of a tribe so closely associated with divine worship, names compounded with some form of the name Jehovah might occur much more frequently than in the other tribes. It might have been considered at first too great a name for any part of it to enter into the names of ordinary men. On such a slender basis as this he pronounces the narrative following upon 2 Chr. xx. 14 as of very questionable historical worth. So, too, he says, 'We need not hesitate to deny the historical character of Jehoshaphat's "princes" etc. [*sic*] 2 Chr. xvii. 7 f.' He allows us still to retain with more probability the 'historicity' of Eliezer, son of Dodavahu (2 Chr. xx. 37). Many readers might well be tempted to ask why the record of parts of Jehoshaphat's reign should be allowed to pass muster, that of other parts not.

It is sufficient perhaps just to note one or two of the decisions of the author as to portions of 1 Chronicles:

'CH
consid
'CH
already
indep

It
facts w
so dog
book
and u
store t

TH
think
Testar
posse
that
sharpl
had b
course
infreq
form o
origin
traditi
by Mo

W
book
tion o
study
or not
where
has gi
useful

The
K

THIS
recent
tion.
a tra
follow
Ordin
cases
with
Catho
to the
omitt
and t
every
Barn

'Chap. iv. 34-41. Judged by the proper names this narrative must be considered thoroughly unhistorical' (p. 236).

'Chap. v. 27-vi. 66. These priestly and levitical genealogies have been already sufficiently discussed . . . and they have been found to be, when independent of old sources still extant, untrustworthy' (p. 238).

It seems to us, considering the limited amount of material and facts we have to go upon, presumptuous, to say the least, to pronounce so dogmatically upon the subject. One can scarcely imagine such a book as 1 Chronicles being such a hopeless congeries of authentic and unauthentic materials, especially when we consider what great store the Jews set by the genealogical tables of their families.

There is perhaps more truth in two other statements which we think are established by the study of the proper names of the Old Testament: (1) that 'in later times a larger proportion of names possess a religious significance than in early times' (p. 250); and (2) that 'in later times Hebrew proper names as a whole became more sharply distinguished from those of other contemporary Semites than had been the case in early times' (p. 252). We welcome, though of course his statement does not go far enough, the statement that the infrequency of names in the earliest period compounded with any form of the name Jehovah 'suggests that the names were of recent origin, and so far, therefore, supports the view that the Old Testament tradition of the introduction of the name Yahweh among the Hebrews by Moses is based on actual fact' (p. 258).

We need only add in conclusion that we part from Mr. Gray's book with much admiration for his industry and with great appreciation of his labours. Much still remains to be done in this branch of study. Mr. Gray would be the first to allow that he has added little or nothing to our knowledge in his treatment of individual names where we might have been tempted to hope for more light than he has given us. The tables at the end of his book will always be found useful for reference.

The Popes and the Ordinal. By A. S. BARNES, M.A. (London: Robert Browning. 1896.)

THIS book contains a collection of documents bearing upon the recent decision about Anglican Orders, together with an Introduction. They are put together in a handy form and accompanied by a translation. After the Bull of Leo XIII., *Apostolicæ Cura*, follows the *Sarum Pontifical*, in English, and the *Edwardine Ordinal*. Then come certain of the documents belonging to the cases put before Paul IV. and Clement XI.; and the book ends with ten sets of "Forms" of Ordination accepted by the [Roman] Catholic Church. It is a pity that some of the documents relating to the papal decisions of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries are omitted, specially when, on taking up a book entitled *The Popes and the Ordinal*, one might have expected to see set out in full everything that they had to say about it. We do not know how far Mr. Barnes may have been refused access to manuscripts in the care

of his superiors ; but it cannot be pleaded that what is omitted is of no consequence. He, at any rate, is responsible for failing to reprint Pole's *Dispensatio Generalis* of Dec. 24, 1554. The omission was made discreetly, if not advisedly ; for it contains a passage once quoted as absolutely decisive of Pole's uncompromising attitude towards Edwardine Orders, but now rendered innocuous by the simple insertion of 'concernentia' in the version of it quoted by no less an authority than Paul IV. (cf. p. 126). We may justly complain also of the scanty shreds meted out to us from the mass of documents which Leo XIII. says that the advisers of his predecessor Clement XI. had before them in the case of Gordon ;¹ and, further, that no notice is taken of the additional papers connected with the Abyssinian question published by Fr. Brandi, S.J., in *Roma e Canterbury* and *La Condanna delle ordinazioni anglicane*.² It must never be overlooked that Clement XI.'s decision in the case of Gordon is the turning-point of the papal condemnation of our Orders. As Mr. Gladstone has forcibly put it : 'We now know, that the inquiry, supposed to be free, was in reality fettered by the condition that it should not bring into question any prior condemnatory utterance of the Roman See ; and that the whole subject had been already decided by such condemnatory utterances.'³ Yet, while such utterances are constantly paraded by the Pope as based upon 'documents of incontestable authenticity'⁴ and by papalist writers as 'given after all possible investigation . . . had been made' (p. 38), no attempt is made by Mr. Barnes or anyone else to give us the series of documents which formed the basis of the investigation in anything like entirety. One or two, of minor importance, have been made public by Fr. Brandi. But so long as the Roman Church, while pretending to give a man everything material for making up his mind as to the crucial cases taken on their merits, merely puts him off with old rags of documents accessible long ago, she only succeeds in fostering his suspicions that what she keeps in reserve is of trifling worth. This method of treating people who desire to get at the truth about a plain fact of history is wanting both in candour and policy. It never succeeds with Englishmen ; and it is one of the main reasons why 'these Papal utterances,' as Mr. Gladstone observes, 'their sincerity notwithstanding, are for us (so far as I know) no siren songs ; they are charged with an ineffable emptiness, and pass by us like the idle wind.'⁵

To discuss the general statement of the case against Anglican Orders as set out in Mr. Barnes's Introduction is impossible here : but one or two brief notes are enough to indicate its worth. The superiority with which he ignores any interpretation of the documents other than his own, is unpardonable in a preface of some forty pages. It has been contended with much force, that the language of the documents relating to Pole's mission accepts or rejects a person's orders not according to the rite by which he was ordained, but according to the status of the ordaining bishop, whether he was or

¹ *Bull.* pp. 12, 13.

² See *Guardian*, Aug. 25, 1897.

³ *Later Gleanings*, p. 414. ⁴ *Bull.* p. 13. ⁵ *Later Gleanings*, p. 426.

was not an 'episcopus rite et recte ordinatus.'¹ On this ground it is intelligible that re-ordinations were in vogue only while men were in doubt and during the first panic of the reaction: that they had ceased altogether some time before the legate arrived; and that, so far from its being the case that 'the orders conferred under the Ordinal were in no case recognized' (p. 9), several Edwardine clergy are known to have been left in possession of their benefices without any re-ordination being required of them.² Pole's practice is at variance with his instructions if, as Mr. Barnes would have us believe, the test was 'By what rite were you ordained?' and not rather 'By whom were you ordained?' We can hardly expect of Mr. Barnes that he should do otherwise than follow implicitly the interpretation placed by Leo XIII. upon the documents of his predecessor Paul IV.: but it cannot yet be maintained that the language of 'Praeclara carissimi' when set side by side with the evidence of the Episcopal Registers in England, is so unambiguous as to 'afford proof of the fact of the condemnation of the Edwardine Ordinal by the Holy See' (p. 11). In a similar spirit of superiority, an *obiter dictum* is enough to dispose of 'such insoluble questions as whether Barlow was himself consecrated and whether the Lambeth Register of Parker's consecration is . . . reliable' (p. 11). These are mere facts of history, resting on evidence ampler than that on which we accept many more important facts. If truth is sacred, there is something of that character pertaining to the ordinary though imperfect methods by which we inquire after it; and to dismiss by a disparaging epithet what is thus established in the usual way, is mere flippancy. At any rate, there was historical evidence sufficient in weight to keep Leo XIII. from alluding either to Barlow's or Parker's consecration as doubtful in fact.

In the second or theological part of the Introduction, we note the same tone of superior indifference whether to consistency or truth. As for consistency, Roman controversialists would never, till quite lately, have joined Mr. Barnes in asserting that 'the question of the validity of the Edwardine forms for ordaining priests . . . is but of antiquarian and scholastic interest' (p. 31); or that 'the inward intention of the consecrating bishop' (p. 34) is of no importance. Both these points were repeatedly urged against us; and the first is still, by the Pope himself³ when, speaking of the Edwardine form of ordination to the priesthood, he says that its 'words . . . do not definitely express . . . the power of consecrating and of offering, &c.' (p. 30). Mr. Barnes is just as careless of exact truth. Question-begging terms like 'Catholic' as opposed to Anglican, 'The Church' when all he refers to is the Roman Church, 'the Catholic Rite' as if there ever was any one such standard, we must expect. But what can be said of the honour of a writer who in the face of the Preface to the Ordinal, and its uniform return to Scriptural phraseology, allows himself to deny that the Reformers, in 'the changes they introduced into the Ordination Ser-

¹ See Church Historical Society's *Treatise on the Bull*, p. 15.

² See Frere's *Marian Reaction*, cc. iv. v.

³ *Bull*, p. 16.

vices, even tried to approximate to a primitive standard' (p. 35)? who twists our assertion that 'Neither Orders nor any other Sacrament else be such Sacraments as Baptism and the Communion are'¹ into a denial on our part that Order is a sacrament at all (p. 39)? who makes the grave accusation against us of not attaching 'grace' to Ordination in the full and real sense of the term (pp. 39-40)? One would have thought that 'Receive the Holy Ghost' without any further specification as to whether it were meant to be 'gratia gratis data' or 'gratum faciens,' habitual or actual, was inclusive enough; and that if some more exact indication of the bestowal of 'gratia gratum faciens' in Orders were wanted, it might have been found, for instance, in the interpretation of the gift of the Holy Ghost as being for a bishop 'the spirit of . . . power and love and of soberness.' What can be more specific, what more comprehensive, than the graces described in this Scriptural phrase? Anglicans do not 'confine' the grace given in Orders 'to the assistance given by God in the work of the ministry,' nor 'are they apt to leave out of consideration almost entirely the gift of power, the spiritual and indelible character and the accession of sanctifying grace, thereby conferred upon the soul of the recipient' (p. 40). Hooker speaks of the 'power' as in the clergy 'not amiss, both termed a kind of mark or character, and acknowledged to be indelible'² so that they constitute an Order and are not merely the occupants of an office. Then (§ 8) he goes on to say that 'when we take ordination we also receive the presence of the Holy Ghost, partly to guide, direct and strengthen us in all our ways, and partly to assume unto itself for the more authority those actions that appertain to our place and calling.' But if this does not make sufficient provision both in regard of grace given for the discharge of an office and of grace given for progress in personal holiness, we forbear to do more than allude to Jeremy Taylor's teaching that 'the clerical ordination is no other but a sanctification of the person,'³ and hasten to refer to the Roman authorities. To begin with Popes. S. Leo and Eugenius IV. are content to describe the grace given in ordination as grace bestowed for the work of the ministry. 'Qui mihi oneris est auctor,' says St. Leo, 'ipse fiet administrationis adjutor, et ne sub magnitudine gratiæ succumbat infirmus, dabit virtutem qui contulit dignitatem.'⁴ And similarly Eugenius IV. merely defines the 'effectum' [Sacramenti ordinis] as 'augmentum gratiæ, ut quis idoneus sit minister.'⁵ It is hard to see how grace given for the due performance of a calling can operate otherwise than by the transformation of the character of him who serves it, and so partake in a real sense of the nature of sanctifying grace. The distinction between 'gratia gratis data' and 'gratum faciens,' though a real distinction, belongs, like the distinction

¹ *Homilies*, ed. Oxford, 1859.

² *E. P. V.* lxxvii. 2.

³ *Clerus Domini*, § vii. 1 (*Works*, i. 43, ed. Eden, 1854), and see the whole context.

⁴ St. Leo, Ser. i. in ann. die Assumpt.

⁵ 'Decretum pro Armenis,' ap. Mirbt, *Quellen zur Geschichte des Papsttums*, p. 104.

between
than o
come
that e
'Conf
... tu
sancti
habit
spect
pro r
and I
seem
which
ing it
the p
imme
Order
the s
way
nor l
with
i Co

A
the m
one t
that
aware
no pl
we k
with
decli
facts
tural
the c
that
duly
the r
mult
comi
short
our
histo

Bish

BAR
done
last
latin

between justification and sanctification, rather to the realm of thought than of experience. And so modern Roman theologians, when they come to deal with the effect of Orders, use language tantamount to that employed by the Popes and the Anglican writers quoted above. 'Confertur gratia,' says Gasparri, '... tum habitualis seu sanctificans ... tum sacramentalis, qua ordinatus valet functiones recepti ordinis sancte peragere. Hæc autem gratia sacramentalis non est a gratia habituali distincta, sed est ipsamet gratia habitualis cum peculiari respectu ad auxilia actualia pro fine sacramenti, id est in casu nostro pro recto ordinis exercitio.'¹ Then he quotes Suarez, Franzelin, and Hurter in support of his teaching. By this doctrine it would seem that while the grace of Orders is of two kinds—(a) habitual, which effects a remoter preparation of the Ordinand merely by fulfilling its primary purpose of helping him to grow holy, or 'sanctifying the person'; and (b) sacramental, which communicates special helps immediately preparing him to exercise rightly the functions of his Order—yet the sacramental grace is to be viewed not as distinct from the sanctifying grace, but as sanctifying grace directed in a special way to the purposes of that sacrament. Now this is neither more nor less than what our writers teach; and only another way of saying with the Scriptures that all the *χαρίσματα* are modes of *χάρις* (cf. 1 Cor. xii. 4-11).

As for Mr. Barnes's parting shaft that 'the principal argument to the minds of many against the truth of the Pope's decision will be one that is subjective and drawn from their own experience' (p. 40), that is simply a gratuitous misrepresentation. We are quite as well aware as Mr. Barnes that feelings and emotions ought to have no place in our judgment of any religious position, and it is because we know it that for all the powers of fascination and attractiveness with which the Church of Rome strikes the imagination, we still decline to join her communion. We make our appeal simply to the facts of Scripture and history. We have an Ordinal perfectly Scriptural in its phraseology, and deliberately framed to the intent that the old Orders should be continued. There are records to show that under it our whole episcopate from Parker onwards has been duly consecrated. The Popes may go on heaping up to themselves the responsibility for perpetuating the divisions of Christendom by multiplying their negative and damnable utterances of others' shortcomings, while never so much as admitting the smallest error or shortcoming on their own side; but no papal artillery can shake our faith in a position that is simply grounded on Scriptural and historical fact.

Bishop Barlow's Dialogue on the Lutheran Factions. By J. R. LUNN, B.D. (London: Ellis and Keene, 1897.)

BARLOW again! and at this time of day! We really thought we had done with him; or, at any rate, that Roman controversialists had at last given him up after that summary dismissal of all questions relating to the private intention of the minister in the Bull *Apostolica*

¹ *De Ordinatione*, § 1130.

Cura: 'The Church does not judge about the mind or intention in so far as it is something by its nature internal; but in so far as it is manifested externally she is bound to judge concerning it' (p. 21). One might have imagined that those judicious words had been taken from our own Hooker: 'We must note that inasmuch as sacraments are acts religious and mystical, which nature they have not unless they proceed from a serious meaning, and what every man's private mind is, as we cannot know, so neither are we bound to examine, therefore always in these cases the known intent of the Church generally doth suffice, &c.' (*E.P.* V. lviii. 3). It must, indeed, have been a sad blow for those retreating 'snipers,' ever driven from point to point, to be bidden to 'retire from that ungodly digression' about Barlow's intention by their own chief; but the Pope has really done them a good turn. If the Bull had been ever so little delayed, a mine would have been exploded under them in this re-issue of the *Dialogue*; and Barlow's intention, for all that they alleged to have depended on it, would have appeared provokingly unimpeachable. We could have wished, indeed, that for controversial purposes, Mr. Lunn had made his discovery a little earlier. It would have been more opportune but not so kind. As it is, however, he has done all sides, and not merely our own, a service. He has given Barlow a decent literary burial; and while we are glad to part company with him, we are glad also to see the last of him in so favourable a light.

To any student of the sixteenth century, the *Dialogue* is full of interest in itself. Its author had heard the fame of the Lutherans. Like so many Englishmen of his day and ours, he was attracted by Protestantism, and took this, as 'omne, ignotum pro magnifico.' He tells us what these attractions were: 'certayn treatyses of Martyn Luther, of the iustifycacion onelye by fayth wythoute good deedes' and 'pleasaüt rumoures of his reformations, highly cōmended amōg new fāgled people' (p. 70). He 'verted, but he took the first opportunity of visiting his new co-religionists for himself, and writes as one who 'by longe experyence had perceaued the fashion, manner, and order of all states among them, and was no small whyle conuersaunt wyth those whiche are of hiest reputation' (p. 35). His object, as 'W.' in the *Dialogue*, is to impart to 'N.'—a typical Englishman, open-minded but, on the whole, inclined to sympathize with Protestantism—what the state of religion and society in Germany really is. He was well qualified for the task, being of an observant, and occasionally of a humorous, turn. He notices many points of interest about Protestantism; how its adherents 'admyt no interpretation of scripture but theyr owne, insomuche that they reiecte parte of the Bible because it serueth not to theyr purpose' (p. 34); how easily its characteristic doctrines run off into antinomianism (p. 44), though perhaps here he is unfair to Luther by representing him as personally to blame for the spread of such tenets (p. 49); and, in more than one place, he gives a painful picture of economic (p. 87) and moral (pp. 79, 117) disorders which accompanied the Reformation. The moral degeneracy of the time is frequently the subject of

Luth
infor
about
syste
luxu
and
Ger
that
Pur
evid
tem
alto
mis
p. 1

ligh
Pri
hou
Bar
But
writ
favo
Chu
Up
onl
som
chu
wh
thro
the
152
the
tra
of
his
the
Di
wh
Al
of
the
an
40-
ed.
sac
pos
pre
wh
(p.
ob

Luther's complaints, and it has become a commonplace with well-informed historians. No doubt it was of long standing, and came about in part by the breakdown of discipline due to the Papal system with its exemptions and indulgences, and in part by the luxury consequent upon the inventions and discoveries of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. It was moreover confined, in the main, to Germany, for elsewhere Calvin's discipline gave to Protestantism that severe and healthy moral tone for which English and Scottish Puritanism were both ridiculed and distinguished. But Barlow's evidence of what he saw is, as the testimony of an honest contemporary, most valuable, the more so 'that Luther himself does not altogether acquit the doctrine of justification—though in his view misapprehended—of blame in this matter' (Beard's *Hibbert Lectures*, p. 146).

But Barlow's *Dialogue* is of greater interest to us for the side light that it throws on his own ecclesiastical position. He was Prior of Bromehill in Norfolk when in 1525 Wolsey dissolved the house to procure revenues for his colleges. This made an enemy of Barlow, who launched out into Lutheranising tracts (p. 19, Nos. 1-6). But after a while he renounced his errors, begged the king in writing to pardon his attacks on the cardinal, presently became a favourite at court, and entered on the road to promotion in the Church by taking employment in the diplomatic service abroad. Upon his return he published the *Dialogue*, 1531, in which he not only announces his recantation of Lutheranism (pp. 70-3), but makes some bold allusions to 'princes . . . bent upō affection agaynst y^e church' (p. 96). This in the year of the 'Acknowledgment,' when it could hardly have escaped being taken to mean that he was throwing himself on to the side of the old-fashioned clergy against the king! Now that Barlow should have turned Lutheran about 1526 when the king had, as yet, no quarrel with the Papacy, and then five years later have ranged himself so deliberately with the traditional party when Henry was fast drifting into the hands of the Boleyn faction and Cromwell, shows that he was a man of his convictions and no mere time-server. What then were his theological affinities? We get hints here and there throughout his *Dialogue* of his own predilections: upon the Eucharist for instance, where he condemns the Oecolampadians and Anabaptists of 'hye Almayne' for excluding 'the corporall eatynge and bodelye presence of Christ' (pp. 71-2); upon the Priesthood, where by speaking of the Levitical Priesthood under the names of 'Bysshoppes, preistes, and deacons' after the manner of St. Clement of Rome (*Ad Cor.* i. 40-44) and the Western Ordinals (e.g. the Gelasian Sacramentary, ed. Wilson, pp. 23 and 151), he would appear to assign similar sacrificial functions to the Christian ministry (p. 103): upon the position of the Pope, if that must be supposed to underlie the expression 'Saynte Peter his vycar here in earth, upon whom and whose faythfull confession, he promysed to bylde his church' (p. 112); and, finally, in regard of ceremonies, upon 'fayth and obedience to y^e church, which I reken no small mater' (p. 77; cf.

p. 82). Barlow, then, it would appear, should be classed with Lee, Stokesley, Tunstal, Thirlby, and others of the old school in theological sympathies, whatever he may have been in action. Certainly he shared their hostility along with the king to private versions of the Scriptures like those of 'Luther and Tyndale, which now corrupt the trewth wyth theyr false gloses' (p. 115); and, just as Henry, by the Commission of 1530, had expressed his willingness to 'cause the New Testament to be by learned men faithfully and purely translated into the English tongue, to the intent he might have it in his hands ready to be given to his people, as he might see their manners and behaviour meet, apt, and convenient to receive the same' (Wilkins, *Conc.* iii. 737), so Barlow was of opinion that 'our question is not whether it be lawfull to let them have it: but whether it be unlawful to kepe them from it, and whether of the twayn is more mete and more expedyent, specially for the tyme that nowe is' (p. 123). On all these points then Barlow ranks with the Old Learning. Whatever, therefore, may be the exact force of a statement like that attributed to Barlow in 1540, that 'only the appointing' and not consecration is requisite to make a Bishop (where, however, 'appointing' means 'only appointing cum impositione manuum' as against 'consecration' in the sense of unction)—see Mr. Lunn's Preface, p. 9, and Pocock's *Burnet*, iv. 478 *sqq.*); whatever appreciable value may be assigned to an argument drawn against a man's intention in 1559 from what it was presumed to have been in 1540; the *Dialogue*, published in 1531 and republished in 1553, when put side by side with its author's official responsibility for the views upon the Sacrament of Order expressed in the Bishops' Book of 1537 and the King's Book of 1543, makes it impossible to suppose that Barlow's sympathies were with the New Learning rather than with the Old. The dispute about his intention is now dead and done with; and Romans, by papal permission, may shake hands with us over its grave. But none the less, we are grateful to Mr. Lunn for his reissue of the *Dialogue*, for it raises a strong presumption that when Barlow consecrated Parker on 17 Dec. 1559 by the Edwardine Ordinal, his intention was just as sound as that of Aldrich when he made use of the same Ordinal in the consecration of Harley to Hereford on 26 March 1553 (Stubbs, *Registr. Sacr. Angl.* p. 104, 2nd ed.).

The Saviour in the Light of the First Century. By the Rev. JOHN PARKER, St. James's, Glasgow. (Edinburgh: J. Gardner Hitt, 1897.)

MR. PARKER begins this work by referring to the 'deep and painful significance' involved in the 'publication of the book entitled *The Saviour in the Newer Light*' as a 'sign of the times,' and as being, in the opinion of many, 'an attempt to ascertain to what extent the conclusions of Rationalism as to the Person and Work of the Lord Jesus would be tolerated by the National Church,' that is in Scotland (pp. 1-2). The standpoint of that book he describes as follows:

'We are given to understand, in brief, that Jesus of Nazareth was a mere man—a very good and holy man—but merely the son of Joseph the carpenter. He never wrought miracles; He did not rise from the dead. Historical Christianity is the product of the superstitious beliefs and the disordered imaginations of His first disciples. It is doubtful indeed if Jesus "really adopted the Messiah character"' (p. 4).

Mr. Parker's very useful defence of the historical belief in our Lord as true God as well as perfect Man is not intended for scholars. It is rather a clear and simple consideration of Scriptural and early Church teaching put in such a form that, as the author points out,

'A plain man with the New Testament before him, and a translation, easily procurable, of the other documents to which we shall refer, is quite as able to come to a just conclusion as the most learned scholar' (p. 21).

The plan adopted is

'to examine the testimony—

'1. Of St. Paul, as recorded in the four Epistles, which all acknowledge to be genuine.

'2. Of St. James, the Lord's brother and first Bishop of Jerusalem.

'3. Of the "Teaching of the Apostles," which issued from the Jerusalem Church, or from a section of it.

'4. Of the Apostolic Fathers of the first century.

'5. Of the Christian Apologists and their adversaries.

'6. Of the heretical teachers of the primitive age.

'7. Of the worship and ordinances of the Primitive Church.

'We shall set aside the Four Gospels and the other books of the New Testament as provisionally out of court, and we shall approach these other witnesses with the question, What think ye of Christ? and if from them all we get an answer identical in the main with the statements of the four Evangelists, we shall have occasion to marvel at the temerity of those who venture to reverse the testimony of the Church Catholic to her Lord, His nature and claims, and to do so with as much nonchalance as if they were dealing with a literary problem, no more affecting the Faith, Hope, and Comfort of the people of God than a discussion about the poems of Homer or Ossian' (pp. 18-20).

On these lines Mr. Parker has produced a book that is likely to be intelligible and helpful to the class of readers for which it is intended; and there is good reason for hoping it may be of service in explaining parts of the evidence upon which the affirmation of the Deity of our Lord rests.

Catholic Faith and Practice. A Manual of Theological Instruction for Confirmation and First Communion. By the Rev. ALFRED G. MORTIMER, D.D., Rector of St. Mark's, Philadelphia, Author of *Helps to Meditation, The Seven Last Words of our Most Holy Redeemer*, etc., etc. (London, New York, and Bombay: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1897.)

WE have great sympathy with the appeal which Dr. Mortimer makes in his preface for a larger amount of doctrinal instruction in the sermons of the clergy. He points out with justice that 'in the early days of the Catholic Revival, the teaching of its great leaders was

almost entirely dogmatic,' while 'systematic doctrinal instruction' at the present time is far too rare. The 'main purpose' of his book *Catholic Faith and Practice* is described as being

'to supply a manual from which the clergy may draw matter for their Confirmation classes and other instructions, and in which the laity may find a simple but full and accurate statement of the Church's teaching on all the chief points connected with the practical life of the Catholic' (Preface, p. vii).

In writing it he has had different kinds of readers in view, and he thus describes those for whom, from his practical experience of America, he thinks it may be useful :

'In the United States there are five classes, with whom we are brought in contact in our work, who need such instruction :

'(1) The children of Church people, whom it is our privilege to prepare for Confirmation and first Communion. . . .

'(2) Then, again, we have a constant stream of sectarians entering the Church, so that a large proportion of our Confirmation classes is made up of converts, often thoughtful people, willing and anxious to be thoroughly instructed in the Church's doctrines. Unfortunately, however, the men are almost invariably hindered by their business from attending a course of Confirmation instructions, and, therefore, have to depend largely on what is given them to read.

'(3) Again, there is a large number of our own people who, though confirmed in youth, have had no definite theological instruction, and have not taken much interest in religion until by God's providence they have been brought in contact with Catholic teaching. . . .

'(4) And we are constantly discovering, even among our most devout communicants, very hazy and inaccurate opinions on subjects of the highest importance.

'(5) Lastly, many of the younger clergy . . . ask for a manual from which they can obtain matter for the instruction of their people' (Preface, pp. viii-ix).

We are inclined to think that Dr. Mortimer would have produced a better book if he had not had the needs of so many different classes in view. There are parts of it the forms of which are obviously due to one or another of them being chiefly considered ; and the result is that a certain want of harmony of treatment injures the work and is likely to lessen its practical usefulness. In spite of this, however, *Catholic Faith and Practice* has many excellences. It is marked by a religious and devotional tone. It is admirably systematic in arrangement, and clear in language. Some readers may disagree with what Dr. Mortimer says. They cannot with any justice complain that he does not show what he means. Moreover, his standpoint is that of Catholic orthodoxy. He himself speaks of it in the following terms :

'I have taken as the standard of doctrine, wherever possible, the teaching of the Catholic Church before the division of East and West ; and in those subjects which had not then received full and definite treatment I have followed the consensus of the Eastern and Western Churches of the present day. And where these do not agree I have generally given both views, and briefly stated the reasons for the one which seems

to
tho
con

alte
whi
unfo
not
very
in F
the
Lor
dust

expe
chap
with
not
acce
the C
But
Chur
who
he sh
some
many
chap
and
of hu
feel t
will g
Lor
mean
speci
fully
so fr
teach
widely
tuniti
subje
book.
The i
pains
nation
have
Lor
again
I
itself
were.
VO

to be preferable. I have also endeavoured to avoid opinions which, though probably tenable, are comparatively modern, and lack Catholic consent' (Preface, p. x).

There are a few matters of detail in which we should like to see alterations in subsequent editions. To mention three instances—while the later treatment of the subject is satisfactory, it is surely an unfortunate expression that the bread and wine in the Eucharist do not '*sensibly*' cease to be 'what they were'¹ (p. 214); it would be very difficult to defend the statement that the Sacrifice of our Lord in Heaven is 'passive' only (pp. 242-3); and we question whether the mystical meaning of the washing of the feet, referred to by our Lord in St. John xiii. 10, is rightly restricted to the removal of 'the dust of venial sin' (pp. 168-9, 179).

To turn to a larger point, we hope Dr. Mortimer may be able to expand the chapter on the Incarnation. In the first part of this chapter he discusses the reasons for the Incarnation, and describes with evident sympathy the Scotist view of its purpose. Now we do not complain that Dr. Mortimer should himself lean towards or accept the Scotist theory. The question has never been decided by the Church, and he has a perfect right to his own opinion about it. But we do think that, in the toleration of both views within the Church, and considering the fact that the most eminent theologians who have written on the subject have adopted the Thomist position, he should have added to his highly sympathetic account of Scotism some statement of the very grave objections which, in the minds of many competent judges, exist against it. The remaining part of the chapter, consisting only of ten pages, is on the fact of the Incarnation and the teaching of the Church about it, including the 'consequences of human nature being assumed by God.' Here, in particular, we feel there is room for great expansion, which we hope Dr. Mortimer will give. There is hardly anything on the nature and use of our Lord's human knowledge; and such important questions as the meaning and value of His temptation and prayers are passed by. We specially regret this because Dr. Mortimer, if he had written more fully on the human side of our Lord's life, would evidently have done so from the ground of historical Christianity and the traditional teaching of the Church. The result is that, while writers who are widely departing from this standpoint are careful not to lose opportunities of promulgating their opinions, the excellent treatment of the subject which Dr. Mortimer might have given us is not found in his book. The question is one that, at the present time, is most pressing. The importance of it in itself is very great. It is of little use to spend pains on teaching about the Sacraments if the truth about the Incarnation is not first made good. A very few additional pages would have enabled the gifted author to add positive instruction on our Lord's Manhood which might have afforded a valuable antidote against prevalent misconceptions which are only too common.

¹ The italics are Dr. Mortimer's, and the sentence, if it stood by itself, would imply that the bread and wine really cease to be what they were.

The manual, as it stands, is valuable. A little revision and some additions would greatly increase its usefulness. We may notice that it contains an excellent table of contents and a copious index.

There are many English clergymen who might learn a needed lesson from a paragraph in the preface :

'While quite recognizing that the teaching at once of everything in this book would be unwise in some parishes, I would point out the great difference between teaching *thoroughly* the doctrines which the people can receive, and waiting till they are able to accept full teaching on other subjects—and the practice, so much to be deprecated, of *watering down* or explaining away unpopular doctrines. Such a course often arouses opposition, leads to accusations of dishonesty, and sometimes makes it extremely difficult afterwards to add the fuller teaching. Surely it is better to avoid such subjects until they can be taught quite thoroughly' (pp. x-xi).

The World of Light. Brief Extracts from Early Greek Liturgies. Translated, with Introduction and Notes, by ADELINE, Duchess of Bedford. (London : Skeffington and Son, 1896.)

In the prefatory note to this little book the Duchess of Bedford refers to the difficulty experienced in making 'a choice in the musical portion of' 'memorial services for the departed' 'which shall give reverent and solemn expression to the feelings of those who are present at such times.' The appropriateness for such a purpose of the 'words sung to a strange Eastern chant' at 'the funeral of the late Prince Henry of Battenberg' and a consequent 'search in the Euchologion, the Service Book of the Orthodox Greek Church,' led the talented authoress to the 'translation of a further portion of the service' of the Burial of the Dead and the publication of it in the work now before us (pp. 9-10).

It is perhaps to be regretted, as has been pointed out in an extremely valuable article entitled 'The Eastern Church and Prayers for the Dead,' which appeared in the *Guardian* for February 24, signed 'W. J. B.,' that certain omissions in the translations prevent them from giving English readers a complete idea of the general character of Eastern services for the departed. Still, the passages which are given are likely to be of great practical utility, and may be helpful both in removing some prejudices against prayers for the dead and in supplying devotions to those who value this Catholic custom.

The Introduction and notes are marked by much thoughtfulness and a deeply religious spirit. In the former we have observed a valuable statement on the way of regarding the dead which characterized the primitive Church.

'The Church is the company of faithful people who are at one with God, the family of God in Christ. The relation of members of the Church to their Head and to one another cannot be regarded as dissolved by their withdrawal from this world, but rather as strengthened by increase of spiritual development. Hence prayer for the faithful Dead, far from being checked, flows on for them in fuller channels than before. The profound conviction of primitive Christianity that Eternal

18
Li
sa
ov
me
om
po
Go
tim
co
car
wa
Bu
err
pet
ign
pre
tak
kne
me
unb
mor
ear

and
men

The

THE
and
inter
sary
The
of m
whic
sibil
on n
write
law
doct
wife
caus
the c
Chris

'
Chris
'I
himse
to son
'T
say th

Life is no mere persistence of being—but rather the natural and necessary state which results from the knowledge of God through Christ—overpowered for a time the sense of limitation in human existence. Life meant no more and no less than this in any sphere of being; and death, once hostile, now prepared the soul with friendly hands for its fuller powers. The serenity of the primitive inscriptions, *e.g.* "May he live in God," bears witness to the fullness and vigour of the early faith. As time went on, many and varying types of character were drawn to a common Fount of hope, which, burying itself deep in the human heart, came forth full of vitality, but perhaps more earthly in kind. Perfection was not yet, though the forces of renewal were strong and were at work. But with Christ within and about her, the Church dared to place her erring dead in His arms and invite her mourners to follow them with petition, praise, and supplication. Whatever their faults—"wilful or ignorant, voluntary or involuntary"—they are her children and she presents them to her God. They are *εὐσεβείς*, holy persons. The Church takes account of them ideally in her services, as of those who have knelt at her altars and partaken of the life-giving power of her sacraments; but she is silent concerning the apostate, the evil-liver, the unbeliever. These are *ἀσεβείς*, and though they may be loved and mourned, and prayed for in secret, her rites are not for them, for on earth they were not of her fold' (pp. 14-15).

Alike for the translations of Eastern prayers which it contains and for very much in the Introduction and notes, we heartily commend *The World of Light* to our readers.

The Marriage Question. A Manual of Notes for Parson and People.
By A. M. O. T. C. M. (London: Simpkin, Marshall, Hamilton, Kent and Co., Limited, *n.d.*)

THIS small book, which costs only one shilling, contains much clear and useful teaching on the subject of Christian Marriage. It is intended for those who are without the time or the learning necessary for the study of larger works or the opportunity of reading them. The chief point in the book is the maintenance of the indissolubility of marriage, and we are glad to notice the clearness and vigour with which it is emphasized. There is also much of value on the responsibilities of marriage, on second marriages, on mixed marriages, and on marriage with a deceased wife's sister. Throughout, the author writes from the standpoint of one who recognizes that the Christian law is absolutely binding upon Christians, and that the Christian doctrine of Holy Matrimony includes the truth that the man and his wife are made to be one flesh by Almighty God Himself. It is a cause of great satisfaction to us to find an unflinching statement on the duty of the clergy with regard to any proposed union between a Christian and an unbaptized person:

'The marriage of a Christian should, of course, only be with another Christian.

'In the registrar's office the follower of Christ can, if he will, unite himself to any woman who is not a Christian at all, and who may belong to some sect which denies our Lord.

'The secular public journals would regard it as ignorant bigotry to say that a person not baptized was therefore not a Christian.

'Nevertheless, a person of the most philanthropic disposition who is not baptized and who refuses to be baptized is, of course, not a Christian.

'No clergyman with a conscience would ever consent to marry such an one to a Christian.

'To be a Christian is not merely to be moral, respectable, and philanthropic; to be a Christian is to be one who has been made a Christian, actually joined on to Christ.

'It is in Holy Baptism that we are made members of Christ and children of God.

'Such an one is bound only to marry a Christian' (p. 108).

It ought not to be necessary to emphasize this point. As a matter of fact, it is by no means uncommon to meet with Churchmen and even clergy who do not realize that a priest ought invariably to refuse to perform the ceremony of marriage between a baptized person and one who is not baptized.

As one of several quotations of value in various parts of the book, we are glad that the writer has recalled to notice some admirable words of the late eminent and learned layman, Mr. John Walter Lea:

'As one man, we ought to resolve that nothing should ever induce us to condone in public or in private life violations of God's law of marriage. No "position," secular or ecclesiastical, no previously high character or "respectability," no legality, no worldly indifference, no fear of being called bigots, no consideration whatever should induce us to treat or to designate adultery as anything but adultery, or incest as anything but incest. Of course I do not mean that we should go about the world reviling others, or blazoning their evil report everywhere. No pure-hearted loving Christian could for a moment think of this. But I mean that, as a truly noble Christian man will, when necessity arises, treat a swindler as a swindler, a liar as a liar, a thief as a thief, yet without any violation of the Christian law of charity; so we should also, regarding the same royal law, resolve to treat the legalized adulterer as an adulterer still, though legalized, and the incestuous person, whether legalized or not, as an incestuous person still. In other words, let us show by our actions that we do regard the law of God, and the Catholic interpretation of that law by the Universal Church of God, as the one and only law for us, and that, in comparison, human laws are as though they were not. Let us be charitable, but on our part also consistent; and let it be seen and known what Word we believe, and what Laws we obey, all the more plainly should the law of the land happen to be against them' (pp. 141-2).

Only, if it is to be fair to 'treat the legalized adulterer as an adulterer still, though legalized,' he must have proper warning what he is doing when he contracts a 'marriage' which Christians cannot rightly recognize. This consideration shows one side of the need for clear and emphatic teaching by the clergy on the subject of Holy Matrimony, and for their uniform refusal to allow the churches of which they have charge to be profaned by ceremonies which are contrary to the Law of Christ.

Divorce. Report as received by the Lower House of the Convocation of York. Edited by a Special Committee by order of the House, with Preface by the Prolocutor. Second edition, enlarged. (Helmsley: Rev. C. N. Gray; and National Society, Westminster, n.d.)

THE controversy which ensued on the publication of the Report on Divorce of the Committee of the Convocation of York led to the recommitment of the Report to the consideration of an enlarged committee. It has now been reissued with some alterations and additions.¹ The second edition is a stronger and more satisfactory work than the first edition; and the significant point about it is that the reconsideration of the subject has not led to any modification in the main conclusion of the absolute indissolubility of Christian marriage.

The Report of the Committee has been received, but not adopted, by the Lower House of the Convocation of York, and consequently the House has no responsibility for it. But it is satisfactory to find the Prolocutor saying:

'It is . . . no less a matter of expediency than a duty to uphold without flinching this law of Marriage in all its strictness and in all its sanctity. And this duty is, under present circumstances, especially and imperatively incumbent on the sacred Synods of the Church' (Preface, p. xi).

And we observe that the Lower House itself adopted, *nemine contradicente*, on June 4, 1896, the following resolutions submitted by the Committee:

'1. That the marriage law of the English Church is that to which those who are members of it must look, and by which they must abide.

'2. That this law is clearly set forth in the Marriage Service, namely, that the sanctity of marriage as a Christian obligation consists in the faithful union of one man with one woman until the union is severed by death.

'3. That this law is in accordance with Holy Scripture, and has the support of the vast majority of Councils, and of Fathers, and these the most weighty.

'4. That this law does not permit the marriage of any person separated by divorce, so long as the former partner is living.

'5. That it is, therefore, inconsistent to issue any marriage licence, or to allow banns to be published, or a marriage to be solemnized with the rites of the Church, for any such person' (p. 100).

We hope that these resolutions and this Report may help to impress the truth of the indissolubility of Christian marriage, and to show to the Bishops how gladly very many of the clergy would welcome a stronger policy than that which they have hitherto thought well to adopt.

¹ The first edition of the Report was referred to in the course of our articles entitled 'Divorce,' in April 1895, and 'The Present Aspect of the Controversy on Divorce,' in January 1896. The Preface to the second edition is dated August 1896.

The Ecumenical Councils. By WILLIAM P. DU BOSE, S.T.D. With an Introduction by the Right Rev. T. F. GAILOR, D.D., Bishop Coadjutor of Tennessee. Second edition. (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1897.)

THE series of 'Eras of the Christian Church' to which this book belongs is intended to furnish popular monographs to give a bird's-eye view of the most important epochs in the life of the Church. The volumes already published or in course of preparation are ten in number, are published at the price of six shillings each, and display the salient points of the apostolic and post-apostolic ages, the ecumenical councils, the times of Charlemagne and Hildebrand, the great Western schism, the Crusaders, the Renaissance, the Protestant Reformation abroad, and the Anglican Reformation at home. The first edition of the volume which is now before us was issued last year, but without Dr. Gailor's concise and attractive Introduction (pp. xix-lxiii), which gives the outline of the events of which the text of Professor Du Bose is the interpretation, and brings the book more into line with the general purpose of the series. The Professor has rather occupied himself with the study of the great subject which dominated the inner life and the best thought of the period, and when we have added to the introduction and the text a chronological table (p. xv), a bibliographical list of ancient and modern works (p. xvii), and two serviceable indices (p. 343), we have named the component parts of a compendious account of the first six councils commonly reckoned as ecumenical, and we are glad that we have kept our notice of it for the appearance of the work in its more complete form. Dr. Gailor insists on a fact which is plainly written across the conciliar period of Church history, and which commanded the attention of Mr. Balfour,¹ that the promulgation of dogma does not restrict freedom, but protects liberty (p. lxxii), and he has some wise remarks in his concluding paragraph on the true place of further research, or, as we should prefer to say, of reverent contemplation, in the region of the Catholic doctrine of the Incarnation. We commend what Dr. Gailor has said to those who are unduly attracted by Scotist speculations, and also to any who are inclined to scrutinize too closely the relation of the two natures of the One Person of our Lord to each other. In the chronological table we are glad to see that the now generally accepted date of 343 is given for the Council of Sardica. The bibliographical list is by no means complete. The monumental work of Labbe and Cossart² ought to have been mentioned, as some other large books of reference were included, and in a book which professed to be written for popular use it was a graver omission to pass over Landon's *Manual of Councils*, a book which gives just the amount of information which the general reader requires in a very handy form,³ suggested by a small French work,

¹ *The Foundations of Belief*, pp. 278-9; cp. the whole chapter on 'Beliefs and Formulas,' p. 251.

² *Consilia Sacrosancta*, in 16 tomes (ed. Paris, 1671).

³ First published in 1845. A new and revised edition was published with no date on the title page in 1893, with a dated preface.

Dictionnaire Portatif des Conciles,¹ also not mentioned by Professor Du Bose. The consideration of the Professor's whole argument in detail lies beyond our present scope, and we shall only refer to it in general terms and notice one or two points which strike us as remarkable. We have no hesitation in saying that the general review which the book makes of the whole subject deserves to be read both by the special student and by those general readers who wish to get hold of the chief points at issue. The Christology of the New Testament (chaps. i. and ii.), Ebionism, Docetism, and Sabellianism (chaps. iii. and iv.) are first considered by way of introduction to the central part of the subject. Then of course we have the usual division of the great heresies of Arianism, Apollinarianism, Nestorianism, and Eutychianism (chaps. v.-xii.), and after this there are further chapters on the Monophysite and Monothelite controversies (chaps. xiii. and xiv.), Adoptionism (chap. xv.), and a concluding chapter on 'the Christological goal' (p. 320). From a general recommendation of these chapters as containing a large amount of excellent material we pass to a few points of detailed criticism. The trained orthodox theologian will find that some undesirable terms are used. 'The triumph of Nicenism' (p. 161) is not a phrase which we should expect a writer to use who believes, as Professor Du Bose believes, that the decision at Nicæa was indeed no more and no less than the expression of the unchanged and unchangeable faith of Christendom. And when more than once we come upon such expressions as the 'duality of our Lord's Person' (p. 23), and 'our Lord's dual personality' (p. 207), we are constrained to say that it never can be well to use phrases which in themselves are unorthodox and which need copious explanation if they are to convey the orthodox meaning which Professor Du Bose desires that they should bear. We will lastly call attention to what we believe to be the most striking novelty of the book, and we will merely mention it without formulating the evidence which might be urged against the Professor's view. It refers to what are called the 'defects' of the Christology of St. Leo, and a somewhat similar charge is made against St. Cyril and even St. Athanasius (pp. 204, 237). The exact words with regard to St. Leo are: 'There is no really human significance given by Leo to any activity or experience of our Lord higher than those which are corporeal' (p. 261). This is not our reading of the Tome, but we have not here space to quote the passages from that famous letter which will occur to many of our readers who are acquainted with it. And passages of equal significance in regard to all the parts of our Lord's humanity could be quoted in abundance from St. Athanasius and St. Cyril: for example, to name no more, from the letter to Epictetus by St. Athanasius, and the commentary upon St. John by St. Cyril. We have sometimes heard the same charge made against the Gospel according to St. John, and we cannot help saying that it is a very serious blot upon Professor Du Bose's work. We must suppose that he has never pursued very far what is such a

¹ An anonymous work in one volume (Paris, 1773).

delightful mode of study for a patristic scholar—the collection of passages which bear on our Lord's humanity in the writings of those Fathers who are defending the truth of His Godhead, and the similar accumulation of passages on His divinity conversely. But the grave deduction which we are forced to make from our approval of the book does not weaken our impression that we have here a bird's-eye view of the councils which is for the most part satisfactory. It is a scene in which the evil is mingled with the good. In some of the orthodox divines evil passions were displayed, and the ominous word *latrocinium* is not appropriate to the proceedings of only one conciliar gathering. Something of haste and narrowness, something of the spirit which the late Mr. Hutton so vividly depicted in his essay on the Hard Church,¹ marred the utterances and the actions of at least one of the brightest defenders of the true faith. There was only one Athanasius, as there was only one St. Paul, and St. Cyril has shown us what the Johannine type of character is in action when it is not completely dominated by the influence of grace. But when all this and much more has been said, we see in the conciliar period that the Church was being slowly guided into a true expression of the faith which she had always held, and we find in her decisions a collection of sacred weapons,² which must be used in the future as in the past if she is to go forth conquering and to conquer.

Charlotte Brontë and her Circle. By CLEMENT K. SHORTER.
(London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1896.)

THESE were cultivated and accomplished women before the days of ladies' bicycles and public agitation about women's rights, and, if we may be allowed to say so, there is a certain charm about the records of their lives of which we are not always conscious in the modern accounts of feminine publicity. It is an old world with peculiar attractions of its own into which we are carried by the mention of the names of the Brontës and Mrs. Gaskell, and the perusal of *Jane Eyre* and *Cranford* and *Mary Barton*. We feel we are within measurable distance of those 'evening assemblies, where the fair sex might participate in conversation with literary and ingenious men, animated by a desire to please,' and which derived their name of 'Blue-stockings Clubs' from grave Mr. Stillingfleet's attire.³ In every few lines of Mr. Shorter's book we come upon some reminder that we are far away from the track of our own times. We read of valentines (p. 86), of the early railway panics (p. 133), of the first movements of the 'Puseyite struggle' (pp. 368, 400), of seeing 'the sea and York Minster' when travelling was uncommon, and then again we are introduced to the amusing guesses of the reviewers who had not found out who Currer Bell was, and to the people who addressed, and heard the voice of, Thackeray. The curates of *Shirley*, the life of the governesses of the period, the silhouettes of the gentlemen,

¹ *Theological Essays*, p. 337 (3rd edition, London, 1888).

² See *Lyra Apostolica*, Nos. lxiv, xc.; *Lyra Innocentium*, vi. 4; St. Cyprian's *Exhortation to Martyrdom*, pref. § 1.

³ Boswell's *Johnson*, iii. 229, ed. Napier.

and
to
of
peru
as w
Mrs.
arriv
well
rous
enab
of C
of 5
in a
first
and
Wet
Chu

THE
Cree
than
flag
have
to th
of a
licen
app
does
Mr.
or e
bein
auth
whic
side
plan
of i
spec
reig
that
are
thro
gen
to a

refer
The
154

and the fashions in the portraits of the ladies, are a refreshing change to us of this day, like the air of a summer holiday. Our knowledge of the Brontë family, and especially of Charlotte herself, after the perusal of Mr. Shorter's book, is increased in the same friendly mode as was our knowledge of Thackeray when we had read the letters to Mrs. Brookfield. In fact the letters of those days really do enable us to arrive 'at the inside of things,' as Newman said,¹ for they contain the well-weighed expression of their authors' inner minds; and the generous loan of many such epistles with other useful documents has enabled Mr. Shorter, in spite of the existence of Mrs. Gaskell's *Life of Charlotte Brontë*, not only to say that the larger part of his book of 500 pages is new, but also to fill up many details of great interest in an already interesting picture. The place of Mr. Patrick Brontë's first curacy in Essex is spelt 'Wetherfield' in the chronological table and 'Weatherfield' in the text and index, but the local form is Wethersfield, rustically pronounced 'Wuthersfull.'

Church Briefs; or, Royal Warrants for Collections for Charitable Objects. By W. A. BEWES, LL.B. (London: A. and C. Black, 1896.)

THE extremely important and interesting rubric which follows the Creed in the Liturgy would form a base for the construction of more than one large book. Much might and ought to be said upon the flagrant breaches of the law of which the printers of the Prayer Book have been guilty in leaving out that part of the rubric which refers to the publication of banns.² Even more pressing is the necessity of a reminder that the Prayer Book gives no countenance to the licence in the matter of notices in church which is so general, and apparently so often free from all constraint, among us. Not only does the rubric contain an express provision on this subject, but, as Mr. Warren points out, 'the restriction to notices ordered by royal or ecclesiastical authority was made in order to prevent public notice being given about merely secular matters.'³ It is to one kind of these authoritative notices that Mr. Bewes draws attention in a volume which will well repay inspection. We may fairly suppose that a considerable number of Churchmen will be grateful to him for the explanatory matter of his alternative title; and, as there was a good deal of ignorance displayed when the recent order was circulated for the special service in connexion with the commemoration of the Queen's reign, it may be well to add Mr. Scudamore's note, which tells us that briefs

'are letters-patent from the Bishop, or from the Crown transmitted through the Bishop. When emanating from the Crown, they have generally been called King's Letters. Their object has commonly been to authorize a collection for some charitable or pious purpose. Such

¹ *Letters and Correspondence of J. H. Newman*, i. 1.

² We much regret to see that the S.P.C.K. has recently omitted the reference to Banns of Matrimony in this rubric in a professed reprint of *The Office of the Holy Communion as set forth in the Prayer Books of 1549 and 1662*, by the Rev. J. P. Faunthorpe, M.A., p. 10.

³ *Prayer Book Commentary* (S.P.C.K.), p. 102.

"charity briefs" are now no longer issued by the Sovereign; but the clause is not obsolete, for the name is equally applicable to Royal orders for the observance of a special day of fasting or thanksgiving.¹

The Briefs with which Mr. Bewes deals were descended from those Papal documents which were of less importance than bulls, and differed from them, as a reference to Dean Hook's *Church Dictionary*, cited by Mr. Bewes (p. 6), shows, in certain details. In the numerous particulars which Mr. Bewes has extracted from a very large number of briefs there is a vast amount of international and local information. These briefs deserve far more attention from historians than they have hitherto received. Writers upon the history of Europe, and upon the special period of the Reformation, will do well to look at the list of international briefs which is printed on pp. 57-9. The historians, and especially the admirers of the Stuart kings, will be interested by Mr. Bewes's success in showing that Richard Cromwell, and not Charles II., was guilty of appropriating the balance of the great collection made for the Vaudois Protestants in 1655 (p. 164). On p. 165 'Charles I.' is an unfortunate slip for 'Charles II.' Facsimiles of briefs for Bethlehem Hospital in 1560, and for the Orange refugees in 1704, are printed (pp. 64, 242) and the compilers of local histories, and clergymen who are interested in the history of their churches, will find many allusions to ancient parochial gatherings of alms in the indices of persons and places benefited, although they are incomplete (pp. 431, 435). Some of these briefs were 'walking' briefs, which produced by far the most money for the churchwardens in the country, and churchwardens and beadles in the city, with their gold-laced hats, gold-headed canes, and all the paraphernalia of office, went round and teased the inhabitants out of their money (p. 1). On more than one occasion, as at Welbourn, in Lincolnshire, in 1667, and a general hurricane in 1703, we read of storms which seem to have anticipated the dreadful tornado which fell upon the Essex farmers a few months ago (pp. 13, 239). The rise of Fire Insurance Offices and the incorporation of the Church Building Society in 1818 were two of the chief causes which led to the decay of the system of collection by briefs. A point which ought not to escape the notice of those who are scandalized or oppressed by the exorbitant fees of diocesan officials is also that the charges and delays in connexion with the system had become intolerable. In 1828 an abolishing Act was passed at the instance of Mr. Peel (p. 44).²

1. *New Starts in Life, and other Sermons*. Eighth Series. By the Right Rev. PHILLIPS BROOKS, D.D. (1896.)
2. *The More Abundant Life*. Lenten Readings. By the same. Selected by W. M. L. JAV. (London: Macmillan and Co., 1897.)

IT is not necessary now to repeat in detail the opinion which we expressed about the writings of Bishop Phillips Brooks two years

¹ *Notitia Eucharistica* (2nd edit., 1876), p. 292.

² A short popular account of Briefs is given in Mr. Cutts's *Dictionary of the Church of England*, p. 96.

ago.¹ The present volumes, one containing a sonnet and twenty sermons, and the other a selection of short pieces from unpublished manuscripts, are strongly marked by the characteristics of the late Bishop, his fine oratory, his cheery optimism, his supreme desire for a tolerant, comprehensive Christianity, and his insistence upon its practical aspects, his remarkable correspondence with the age in which he lived, and the eagerness with which he seized upon its good points, while he shared in its defects and exposed himself to its dangers. The eighth series of the sermons falls between the years 1873 and 1890, and contains discourses on general subjects. We could never recommend a young preacher to saturate his mind with these sermons, and to leave other sermons alone, but we are sure that many a preacher would improve his manner and his matter if he would read one of these sermons from time to time, and then thoughtfully ask himself why the preacher won the full attention of the men who heard him. One of the best sermons in the book which may serve for this purpose is that upon the sacredness of life (p. 106), in which the preacher's 'pure consciousness of joy in the mere fact of being alive' (p. 110) is felt like a fresh sea breeze, and is illustrated by the passage on 'the wild joys of living' from Browning's *Saul*,² and the still better known expression of the same truth in 'Truly the light is sweet, and a pleasant thing it is for the eyes to behold the sun.'³ This is the life which we ask for, and in return God gives us life for ever and ever—a theme on which the preacher speaks very finely. We may add that if the sermons are really to be studied as illustrations of the art of preaching they should be read along with the author's lectures on preaching, which, if they look on the minister of Christ too much as a preacher of sermons only, are in their narrow range far the best that we have ever read.⁴ A sermon on the labourers in the vineyard gives the title to the book. One other parable, the tares and the wheat, forms the subject of a sermon (p. 20), and there are sermons on two of our Lord's miracles (pp. 193, 234). 'The Pre-eminence of Christianity' (p. 320) is a powerful exposition of St. Peter's question, 'Lord, to whom shall we go?' And even more striking is the sermon on 'The Mitigation of Theology' (p. 337), which declares and rejoices that Christianity is gentle, but insists on the necessity of its sternness towards sin, and contains a tremendous assault on the excuse of men who say that they have been alienated from religion by the terrors of Puritan theology (p. 340). The little volume of Lenten Readings contains passages which will probably do much to spread the demand for the late bishop's larger works. The short extract in verse, and the brief prayer, with which each section concludes, make the book very suitable for devotional use. The discipline which the Church puts before us during Lent, and, we may also add, on all Fridays in the year except Christmas Day, on the Ember and Rogation days, and on the eves of certain Saints'

¹ *The Church Quarterly Review*, No. lxxx. p. 269.

² *Works*, vi. 98.

³ *Eccles.* xi. 7.

⁴ *Lectures on Preaching*. (London: Griffith, Farran, and Co., 1886.)

days, is not an exercise for a select company of choice Churchmen. It is a necessity for all Christians, man being what he now is, if they are to keep the various parts of their constitution in proper harmony and under control. Bishop Phillips Brooks was particularly fitted to be the teacher of this lesson, from the wide influence which he exercised over his fellow-countrymen, and we are glad to see a book in which this useful teaching is enforced, even if we already possess more profound sources of instruction on the subject.¹

Oxford House Papers. By Members of the University. (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1897.)

MANY clergymen with wide pastoral experience have found that the Oxford House papers must be read in their own studies, and pass through a process of free translation in their own minds, if they are to be of any use in dealing with the real difficulty of a particular man. Why this is so cannot perhaps be said. There is a great difference between the conversation of the common room 'after hall,' and the continual arguments that are carried on in places of business, or in railway offices, or in the workshops of the industrial north. The narrow logic and the cynical selfishness which may wither the brightest intellect have little in common with the sorrows and mysteries of domestic life, and an afternoon Oxford walk presents great contrasts to a series of visits in a small alley. But these obvious reflections go but a short way in explanation of the fact that it is at secondhand that the Oxford House papers can be most profitably employed in pastoral work. We have, for example, more than once taken up the first paper in this series, by Canon Gore on the Athanasian Creed, wondering whether we could put it into the hands of one or two cultivated men and women who hate the days on which the Athanasian Creed is recited, partly because they know nothing about Church history, partly because they do not understand that conditions of some kind must be attached to salvation, and partly because they ignore altogether the revelation of the Bible as to the sterner aspects of the relation of God to men. But while we find much to our purpose we also find much that is not, and we resolve, as we always do when we go to the Oxford House papers, that we will read the paper ourselves, and then talk to our people. Not one of the lay folks that we have in mind would get through the first section of Canon Gore's paper (p. 2), and so would miss the excellence of the later parts, and in particular the remarks on 'the only legitimate meaning of breadth in connexion with the Church' (p. 24), which we should much like them to read. But then, again, we do not at all want to encourage a practice of trifling with the authority of the Prayer Book, and reciting the Creed after the evening service (*ibid.*). In view of the recent Lambeth Encyclical and Reports Canon Gore's revised translation of the *Quicumque* acquires a special significance (p. 26). The paper on

¹ For example, in that sermon of Dr. Liddon's which discusses the principle of self-denial with such remarkable fulness, *Sermons on some Works of Christ*, p. 78.

undenominational religious instruction, by the Rev. G. W. Gent (p. 146), is, to our mind, by far the best in the book, and full of points well put. We hope that it will be read and taken to heart, and in particular that attention will be paid to Mr. Gent's remarks about the supplementary theory of Sunday schools (p. 161). When speaking upon the position of the Bible in the school (p. 154) we should have been glad to have had a word from Mr. Gent on the great importance, which we commend to his notice, of reading a short lesson from the Bible every morning as a part of the opening devotions of the school. If the teacher reads this lesson, and the whole school stands and listens, and at the close responds, 'Thanks be to Thee, O Lord,' then the Bible is placed in its proper unique position in the school. *In how many Church schools is this done?* It is sad to have to believe that next in importance comes a paper on 'Suicide,'¹ by the Rev. H. H. Henson (p. 64), containing some advice to clergymen, editors, coroners, and magistrates, by which the crime of self-murder may be 'referred back to the category of general abhorrence from which it has so largely emerged' (p. 75). Two papers which are likely to play a serviceable part in the spread of knowledge of the position of the Church of England are 'Church and State,' by the Bishop of London, and 'What do we mean by the National Church?' by Mr. Wakeman. A smaller circle of readers will be interested in two papers on 'The Old Testament an Essential Part of the Revelation of God,' by the Rev. W. Lock, who is still described, in the table of contents, as 'Sub-Warden of Keble' (p. vii), and on 'The Canon of the New Testament,' by the Rev. W. Sanday (pp. 76, 105).

The Modern Reader's Bible. A Series of Works from the Sacred Scriptures presented in modern literary form. Edited by PROFESSOR MOULTON. (New York and London: Macmillan and Co., 1896-7.)

WE have already noticed the earlier volumes of this series, and expressed our opinion very frankly upon them. It will not be necessary, therefore, again to describe the general features of Professor Moulton's work in detail, though we may express a little surprise that there is a sufficient number of persons who are content to look at the Bible only from a literary point of view to justify an addition of eight volumes to the series. We now have some historical books (Genesis, the Exodus, the Judges, the Kings, the Chronicles), two prophetic books (Isaiah and Jeremiah), and a volume of 'Biblical idyls,' in which the apocryphal book of Tobit is associated with three books from the sacred canon—the Song of Solomon, Ruth, and Esther. For ourselves we dislike the whole mode and principle of the series, and prefer to seek for aid in the study of Holy Scrip-

¹ Liddon, *Univ. Sermon*. ii. 344; *Easter Sermon*. i. 11, 121, ii. 70; *Some Elements of Religion*, lect. iii. § 4. Compare Paley's *Moral and Political Philosophy*, book iv. chap. iii. For suicide among the Donatists see Robertson's *Hist. Church*, i. 278; and for Scriptural passages see Bishop Wordsworth's Commentary under 'Suicide' in the index.

ture in an atmosphere where we feel at home. We even feel some reluctance to place the Church's book, which we believe to be the Word of Life, into the hands of those who will pay compliments to its literary beauty, and think that their duty towards it is completely discharged. We reflect that Hezekiah showed Merodach Baladan the sacred treasures, and that we admit our distinguished heathen visitors to our abbeys and cathedrals without telling them that art, science, and literature must be accompanied by unseen spiritual forces before true national progress can be achieved. And if we are interested for the moment in Professor Moulton's way of putting some of his information in his little Introductions and notes we are by no means persuaded that it would be a wise course of action to give these books to anyone who believed no more about the Bible than could be learned from their perusal. The fact is there is throughout the series a dreary, though an acknowledged, silence upon all that makes the Bible unique.

A History of Pembroke College, Oxford, anciently Broadgates Hall, in which are incorporated short Historical Notices of the more Eminent Members of this House. By DOUGLAS MACLEANE, M.A., sometime Fellow, Lecturer, and Chaplain, and formerly Scholar. With Illustrations. (Oxford: Printed for the Oxford Historical Society at the Clarendon Press, 1897.)

THE Author of this work, whose family name will be familiar to classical scholars, has been uncommonly industrious in the collection of his facts. We could name but few out of the thirty-two volumes of the Oxford Historical Society's previous publications which surpass this last contribution to the series in general literary excellence. It can only have been brought to its present form after years of labour and innumerable journeys for the investigation of localities and the exploration of a great variety of archives and documents. All true lovers of scholarship will appreciate the manner in which Mr. Macleane has finished his work. Those who are interested in the history of the University of Oxford will find in the history of Pembroke College, originally called Broadgates Hall, and covering the sites of four or more ancient halls (p. 33), a rare example of the working of the old aularian system, of which St. Edmund Hall is now the only survivor. Pembroke College, as such, was one of the three Stuart collegiate foundations at Oxford, and though younger and smaller than many other colleges, its records show that good use has been made of the peculiar advantages which belong to a comparatively small society. The names of many eminent and honourable men who have served God in Church and State are inscribed upon its roll; and of these, its best remembered sons, Mr. Macleane gives a series of biographical sketches. In his own words:

'Of a succession of great canonists, Repyngdon, Bonner, and Story played bold parts in the prelude or drama of the Reformation. Jewell resided and taught here at a critical part of his career. Among the men of letters, of law, and of action in the spacious Tudor times were such as Heywoode, Beaumont, Peele, Fitz-Geffrey, Dyer, Randolph, and the

Carews. Pym and Speaker Rous were leaders in the troubled days that followed. Camden, Corbet, Browne, Collier, exemplify in different ways the Stuart literature. Chief-Justice Scroggs recalls the State trials of Popish Plot days. Lord Chancellor Harcourt links us to the wits and Tory politicians of "great Anna's" Augustan age. In the early Georgian period there were almost contemporary at Pembroke the greatest moralist and man of letters, the greatest jurist, and the most famous preacher of the eighteenth century; and of the college days of Johnson and Whitefield, as also of Shenstone and Henderson, interesting records are preserved. Finally, an archbishop has been contributed to each of the primatial sees of Canterbury, York, and Armagh' (pp. vii-viii).

For Pembroke men, of course, every page of Mr. Macleane's *History* will be interesting. They will, we suppose, take some pride in the reflection that the Master of their college is now the only head of an ancient Oxford foundation, with the exception of the Dean of Christ Church, who must be in Holy Orders. In writing on the Mastership of Dr. Jeune, Mr. Macleane has kept his own Tory and Tractarian proclivities entirely in the background, and in his endeavour to be fair has allowed Dr. Jeune's own friends a little too free a hand. We particularly wish that Mr. Macleane had had the courage to describe Jeune's sale of the advowson of St. Aldate's in the terms which it deserved. We regret also that the absence of records has prevented Mr. Macleane from giving a satisfactory account of the cricket of the College; that his scheme did not allow him to do more than to mention in footnotes the name of one who served the College with exceptional devotion (pp. 369, 469, 488); and that he yielded a little too much to the temptation to enlarge upon the men of his own generation. But we confess that it was only just to give full scope to praise on the subject of the noble benefactions to support the dignity of the worship of the College which marked the residence of Mr. Athelstan Riley.

We should add that the book will be welcome to those who love good stories, and it is only an old generation of Pembroke men who will notice a little error in the story about Henney, who was so sensitive to undergraduate false quantities that, says Mr. Macleane, 'he kept on his table a bottle of smelling salts' (p. 481). To be quite accurate, Mr. Macleane should have said that Henney always held this bottle in his hand, and as he never under any pretext relaxed his hold upon it, he was able to take his sniff warm and strong, and fortify himself with the maximum amount of pungency. We stop here abruptly, lest we should transcribe one after another of Mr. Macleane's delicious morsels, and even perhaps draw upon our own supplies of Pembroke reminiscences.

Looking Upward. Papers introductory to the study of Social Questions from a religious point of view. By JAMES ADDERLEY. (London: Wells, Gardner and Co., n.d.)

THE absence of a date from the title-page of this 'collection of articles and speeches written and delivered at different times to various groups of persons,' is supplied by a dated preface, but even without this the contents of the book declare plainly enough that

they belong to the last decade of the century in which the social aspects of Christianity have been so much emphasized. Mr. Adderley, who also omits on his title-page to say whether he is a clergyman or not, addresses himself in the main 'to those who are alarmed both for their own sakes and for the sake of their fellow men at the increasing seriousness of what is called the social problem' (Pref. p. viii). It would cover the greater part of the ground of his book to say that he asks his hearers to review their life in the light of the teaching of the prophets and the New Testament, especially the Sermon on the Mount. In doing this he has displayed much zeal and enthusiasm, and has struck out right and left at many weak places in modern Christian life. We respect honest enthusiasm too much, and recollect too many instances in which noble ends have been achieved by the religious use of excited feelings, to wish to nip Mr. Adderley's zeal in the bud, or to repress his vigour in any way. But we cannot help saying that it is not very difficult and not very laudable to pick holes in the lives of our neighbours, or to use vituperative epithets a little too freely. And while we have no doubt that Mr. Adderley's style of denunciation will appeal to minds of a certain kind, we do not know that he has added anything in this book to the fundamental principles of the two sermons which he so justly admires—Dean Church's discourse on Christ's Words and Christian Society, and Dr. Pusey's on Christianity without the Cross.¹ A paper on 'Slumming' (p. 1), and another entitled 'Thoughts for the Thoughtful Rich' (p. 121), have already appeared in other publications. We are glad to see that Mr. Adderley has spoken out straight to working men on Christ and social reform (p. 32). The same subject was considered in its relation to the clergy in a Church Congress address (p. 21), and with this may appropriately be read the treatment of the question, 'Is there a Social Gospel?' (p. 71). Addresses to the English Church Union and the Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament were delivered upon the relation of the Christian Social Union to the Catholic movement, and upon the social aspect of the Holy Eucharist (pp. 102, 155). Three papers discuss the important functions which community life may discharge in social reform (pp. 171, 210, 219), and a collection of texts has been compiled from the prophets which are supposed to have a special application to social duty. Extracts from the Rev. F. D. Maurice, Professor Marshall, and the Bishop of Durham are printed in a short appendix (p. 259). We will not give instances, though there are many, in which we deprecate Mr. Adderley's language. No advantage can be gained by the advertisement of wild hitting. But it will be a pleasure and profitable withal to mention one or two passages which illustrate the vivid expression of thought for which the book is worth reading. 'Hypocrisy is a plant that does not flourish among working men' (as

¹ With these it is well to read that wonderful sermon of Newman's on 'The Apostolic Christian' in *Sermons on Subjects of the Day*, p. 274, though in referring to it we bear in mind the wise words of Hooker (*Ecc. Pol.* iv. 2, 4) that 'they who recall the Church unto that which was at the first, must necessarily set bounds and limits unto their speeches.'

a class, we should add). "If I am to be religious I will be thorough; I don't see my way to being thorough; therefore I won't take up with it." This is the sentiment of many a working man' (p. 16). Four reasons why social reform should be Christian are: (1) Because Christianity supplies social reformers with an inspiration for their work; (2) many of the principles on which secularist reformers are already working are distinctly Christian; (3) the visible Church offers the most powerful inspiration and the matured and permanent organization for social reform; (4) Christianity supplies that which is lacking in all modern social schemes, viz. the power of moulding human character to suit new conditions of life (p. 42). If we ask what is the secret of the increase of hard-working clergy? Mr. Adderley replies, 'Dogma has done it. They believe, and therefore they act' (p. 129). Lastly, at the close of some excellent remarks about the way in which secular social reformers 'ignore sin, which is the very root of social distress,' Mr. Adderley quotes with approval the very true observation of the Rev. S. D. Headlam that 'the greatest work of social reform is not being done by the noisy agitator, but by the quiet parish priest, who baptizes the babies, marries the lovers, prepares children for Confirmation, and celebrates the Holy Eucharist' (pp. 169-70).

A Spiritual Faith. Sermons by JOHN HAMILTON THOM. With a Memorial Preface by JAMES MARTINEAU. (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1895.)

THE author of these sermons was a great power among the older kind of Unitarians, and though for nearly thirty years (1866-94) Mr. Thom had ceased to do ministerial work, many of his old friends, including Mr. W. Rathbone of Liverpool, wished to have a volume of his writings, and invited his intimate friend and fellow-labourer, Dr. James Martineau, to write a Memorial Preface. The result is that the Preface, by one so aged and such a keen judge of character, is the most interesting part of the volume to those who do not belong to the Unitarian community. No one who is not an Unitarian will be greatly attracted by Mr. Thom's writings. He certainly wrote good English, was at times eloquent and very much in earnest, but the style is ponderous, and the appeal is to the intellect rather than to the heart, and there is a tone of prejudice and of disappointment in the teaching. And yet, as Dr. Martineau tells us, Mr. Thom belonged, by his natural bent of character and his training in the North of Ireland, to the older school of Unitarian preachers, who could not admit the modern developments of that body. He was a veritable Arian. He maintained the pre-existence of the Son of God, and His more than human relation to the Father; and he remained unaffected by the Higher Criticism, accepting St. John's Gospel equally with the Synoptists, and regarding the whole Bible as the Word of God. He also upheld the importance of the Sacraments, although he gave them a wholly symbolical interpretation. His great power appears to have lain in the exposition of Scripture, some examples of which are given in this volume, viz.

VOL. XLV.—NO. LXXXIX.

S

Sermons X., XI., XII. Dr. Martineau has a very high opinion of his preaching (Preface, pp. xx-xxi, xxiv), and of his ability as an extempore speaker (p. xxviii). The portrait of Mr. Thom given at the beginning of the volume represents a deeply thoughtful face, not unlike that of the Rev. Charles Kingsley. There are twenty-two sermons or portions of exposition contained in this volume, some of which well illustrate Dr. Martineau's estimate of Mr. Thom's theology. The first, upon 'God is a Spirit,' puts forward some grand thoughts about the Deity, deeply spiritual, but not easy to grasp, and quite unsuitable to the modern requirements of the pulpit. The mediatorship of Christ and His eternal relations with God are recognized (p. 14), but there is a lack of fervour in this setting forth of the soul and God without any intermediate means of fellowship, no Church, no Creed, no Ritual, no Sacrament. Unitarianism as a practical religion must be deathly cold and unattractive. In the second sermon, on 'Spiritual Likeness to God,' there is a further recognition of the relations of the Father to the Son (p. 23, *cp.* p. 113), which is absent from modern Unitarianism; and the principal theme of the sermons which follow is Providence and our realization of it within our own spirit. Mr. Thom is strongly opposed to fatalism, and greatly values the power of prayer (pp. 94-5), but there is such a lack of warmth in his theology—so very different from the Catholic Faith. Still, we must be grateful to him for statements like the following, viz.:

'Religion is the feeling of God Himself acting on the soul; theology is man's thought of God in a symbolized form: it is, therefore, unavoidable that it should present God in the intellectual image of Man. Theology is not God, but man's philosophy of God; and as a substitute for the teaching of the Holy Spirit it is fatal to religion: it is to interpose the formulas of our own minds between us and the living Spirit' (pp. 10-11).

We may not like the manner in which he has expressed the difference between religion and theology, but we must welcome the general tenor of the distinction. So, again, we are glad to have such a reminder as the following, viz.:

'There is always this danger ["the danger of allowing much discussion and even real interest on matters of Religion to draw us away from God"] when Religion becomes a literature—when it is the study of records, instead of intercourse with a Person' (pp. 113-14).

In Sermon VIII, upon 'Honour all Men,' one must acknowledge that Mr. Thom suggests some important considerations about the capacities and possibilities of human nature as demanding recognition and respect from us, but he scarcely preaches the Gospel of St. Peter. Contrast his sermon with that famous one by the late Dr. Liddon on the same subject,¹ and one feels at once the difference between the cold, hard, uninspiring theology of the Unitarian and the invigorating creed of the Catholic Church. The Incarnation and the Redemptive Work of the Son of God have made the whole difference in the honour that is due to humanity. Mr. Thom cannot

¹ *University Sermons*. First Series. 'The Honour of Humanity.'

rise to that ; he appeals to the intellect and reason, but he fails to touch the heart. Then, again, in estimating the character of Jacob (Sermon XIV), he can see nothing in the patriarch but 'a type of spiritual selfishness' (p. 225) ; he does not see that Jacob was entitled, through Esau's profaneness, to his father's blessing, and his vow at Bethel is put down as 'conscious selfishness bargaining with God' (p. 227). The whole sermon is most unfair and full of prejudice, simply because Jacob's life is not considered as a whole, but piecemeal, and apart from the working out of the Divine purpose in the chosen family. Lastly, when he deals with the Last Supper (Sermon XX), while Mr. Thom admits the perpetual symbolism of the meal, yet he explains away all that was said and done, so that to him there is no virtue in Communion. 'Our spiritual fellowship, indeed, in no way depends upon the symbols that express it to us. Whatever may be the power of natural sacraments in conveying vivid impressions to us, they do not *make* the truths of which they are signs' (p. 333). We cannot help contrasting the attitude of Mr. Thom's sermons with that most interesting book which appeared in 1890 from the same firm of publishers, viz. *An Appeal to Unitarians : being a Record of Religious Experiences, by a Convert from Unitarianism*, for it deals with just those points which appear to be most defective in Mr. Thom's theology, viz. in regard to the Incarnation and the Lord's Supper. The appeal is a very strong one.

The Bishop Paddock Lectures, 1896-97. Outlines of the History of the Theological Literature of the Church of England from the Reformation to the close of the Eighteenth Century. By JOHN DOWDEN, D.D., Bishop of Edinburgh. (London : Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1897.)

'THE lectures are mainly concerned with tracing the growth and changes in religious opinion, indicating the character of the principal works of the more eminent theologians, and in some degree estimating their value' (Preface). The chief merit of these lectures is their suggestiveness : those who heard them delivered, and those who read them in this handy little volume, cannot help wishing to know more of English theology. And if the students of our theological colleges could be induced to read the great works of English divines, they would be far better equipped for the ministry of the Church than if they had absorbed the arguments of the last new work embodying the results of a criticism 'made in Germany.' The clergy would be better able to deal with the religious and moral problems of the day if they had studied the past history of the English Church, and, specially, of those controversies which have produced the sound standard of divinity which is exhibited by the Book of Common Prayer. Those past controversies are continually reappearing in some form or other in the present time, and can be fairly met only by a thorough knowledge of the history of the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries. This little book will encourage such studies by making the reader consult larger works, and we can heartily commend it to the notice of the principals and lecturers of our theological colleges.

'The main lines along which our leading theologians moved and laboured were three in number ; and into each of them they were directed and compelled by the exigencies of the hostile attacks against the doctrine and constitution of the Church. First in order of time, and chief, if we consider the long-continued persistence of the assault, was the controversy forced upon the Church of England by Rome. Next in succession and historical importance, came the large body of literature that was issued in defence of the Church's constitution against the attacks of the Puritan party. Lastly, the Church was called upon to defend the primary and essential fundamentals of the faith against assaults from the side of unbelief' (pp. 5, 6).

The above quotation will indicate the general plan of the volume, and the working out of this plan is excellently done. The lectures are necessarily brief and condensed, but they contain enough about the chief writers and their books to rouse a real interest in them. Here and there the information is scrappy, because the lecturer has attempted to cover too wide a space, and has dealt with too many names. This is specially observable in the last lecture, which treats of the eighteenth century, and contains only twenty-three pages, whereas the other lectures (except the second) average forty pages each : it is indeed a 'rapid survey' (p. 210) of a most important period ; but fortunately the student can turn to Abbey and Overton's account of it, and find everything that he can want. To give Bishop Butler one page, Waterland a few lines, and Bingham a mere notice, is not what we should have looked for in a review, however brief, of theological literature. We were surprised, too, to find that no notice had been taken of Mr. Hutton's volume on Archbishop Laud, nor of Mr. Ottley's account of Bishop Andrewes, nor of the reprint (1893) of William Law's *Defence of Church Principles*, nor of those two volumes of 'St. James' Lectures' (1877, 1878) entitled *Classic Preachers of the English Church*. Such omissions make us feel that Bishop Dowden has not kept himself posted up in the current literature of the subject of his lectures. We name these books because there is evidence in his notes that he is acquainted with the earlier writers of this century, but not with the more modern, except in a very few cases. One other criticism we must make, viz., that in dealing with the Eucharistic teaching of the several writers the lecturer shows a strong bias against the advanced school of High Churchmen, and in favour of the Sacramentarian position, which is all the more remarkable considering his own championship of the Scottish Liturgy, and the Prayer Book of the American Churchmen before whom he was lecturing. We are quite sure that Bishop Dowden is not responsible (except perhaps in neglecting to correct the proof-sheets) for attributing to Bishop Bull a work dealing with the 'Anti-Nicene' writers ; but, alas ! the blunder occurs four times (pp. 181-82). We will conclude with a quotation which exactly expresses our own sense of admiration for the worth of English theology, viz. :

'But you will ask, "Do such studies bear upon the life and the questions of to-day?" I answer emphatically "Yes." There is no large question of current interest, no matter of present debate in the religious world, which has not, in *essence and principle*, been dealt with by the great

masters of the past. Look how, even in the field of physical contests, where the conditions of warfare have of late been really and materially altered, our great generals devote their time and energies to study the strategy of the campaigns of Cæsar, of Marlborough, of Wellington, of Napoleon. Much more will the advantage of such studies be apparent in the warfare of the world of intellect' (p. 211).

Sermons preached in the Cathedral at the Commemoration of Founders of the King's School, Canterbury, on Speech Day, from 1887 to 1896. With frontispiece. (London, New York, and Bombay: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1897.)

THIS volume contains ten sermons by various preachers. Naturally, they differ much in subject and in interest and power. Among the most useful we may mention 'The changing and the sure' by Dr. Field, the warden of Radley College; 'Abide in me' by Dr. Butler, the master of Trinity College, Cambridge; and 'The Monastic Orders and our Public Schools' by Dr. Gibson, the vicar of Leeds; while there is much that is beautiful in Mr. R. L. Otley's 'Faith and Consecration.' But the sermon which, in our judgment, best deserves preservation in a book is that by the late Dr. Wilson, the warden of Keble, entitled 'Religion the Basis of Education.' The lamented author clearly distinguishes between mere instruction and education; points out that education 'is the training of the whole inner self, not only of the mind but of the soul and spirit—the character and life' (pp. 132-3); and emphasizes the need of the 'religious groundwork of education' (p. 137), which requires the whole ordered system of the Catholic Church.

'Be it remembered (as we require, it seems, to be reminded), the boy at a public school has all the needs and requirements of a Churchman elsewhere. His moral and religious life requires all the helps and safeguards that it requires elsewhere, and which it has in the doctrine and discipline of the Church and in the worship of the Church. He has not only a mind to be stored with knowledge, and a career before him in which he may be immediately useful. He is an immortal being with an eternal destiny. He has a soul that has been reborn in Baptism into the Divine Society. As he grows up, his spiritual outfit has to be completed by the gift of the Holy Spirit in Confirmation, and the spiritual life in him has to be strengthened and refreshed by the Sacrament of the Lord's Body and Blood. He has to live in an atmosphere of grace, kept within constant communication of the Divine Centre by hearing the word of God and by joining in worship. He has constantly to receive fresh strength, which shall enable him to overcome all the evil forces around and in him. He wants all the resources of the Church ordered and made ready for his constant use' (pp. 138-9).

My Neighbour. Plain studies for my people. By the Rev. SAMUEL HERMPHILL, D.D., Rector of Birr; Professor of Biblical Greek in the University of Dublin; Select Preacher, 1891-2; Examining Chaplain to the Lord Bishop of Killaloe; M.R.I.A., &c. (Dublin: William McGee, 1897.)

THIS little book consists of plain instructions on the last six of the Ten commandments. They are characterized by much simplicity of thought and plainness of expression. We may illustrate their stand-

point and style by two quotations, one on a doctrinal, the other on a practical subject :

'We are now in the midst of a world-wide reaction against the old ideas of future punishment. But let us take care ; let us make very sure of our ground before we presume to question with the serpent, "Yea, hath God said?" With the Gospels before us we are incurring a heavy responsibility if we undertake to minimize the terrors of God's wrath against sinners. . . . Souls have to be saved—from what? . . . From something in the future which our Saviour describes by the most awful names and epithets' (pp. 27-8).

'In at least five different ways we see sin entering into gambling. First, there is discontent with the slow and painful process of making money by honest work, which is the natural and normal method sanctioned by God. Second, there is covetousness as regards the money or property of another, which we wish to transfer to ourselves by a short and easy method. Third, there is dishonesty to our own family, in taking the money which God intended for their good, and staking it in a way in which it will probably be lost, without any benefit accruing to them. Fourth, there is unkindness to the family of the other person, on whose money we have set anxious eyes ; for, if we win, we are inflicting loss and damage on them. Fifth, there is an example set to others, which most probably will have some effect in loosening the hold which prudence and contentment have on them.

'And, over and above all these, there is certainly, in the case of us Christians, sin in handling our money in a way on which we cannot ask the blessing of God, and in dealing with our neighbour in such a way that the more he loses the better pleased we shall be' (pp. 78-9).

Foundations of Faith. From the German of Fr. L. VON HAMMER-STEIN, S.J. Part I. The Existence of God demonstrated. (London : Burns and Oates, Limited, 1897.)

THIS book is a translation of the first part of a German work, the second and third parts of which are on 'Christianity' and 'Catholicism' respectively. It is written from the standpoint of a Roman Catholic who cordially accepts the position of the Vatican Council of 1870, that 'the one true God' may 'be certainly known by the natural light of human reason,' and who is a vehement opponent of the theory of evolution. Thus, he denounces the 'Protestant theology,' which declares 'the demonstrations of God's existence to be merely grounds of probability and not strict proofs' (p. 8), and throws his presentation of the 'cosmological' and 'teleological' arguments into a form that is strongly antagonistic to the evolutionist position. The book is in the guise of a series of letters between 'Father H.' a Roman Catholic priest, 'Mr. N.' an 'Evangelical minister,' evidently a Lutheran, and 'O.' a 'student of Evangelical theology,' who has abandoned belief in Christianity and an 'extramundane God.' There is much that is forcible in its criticisms, alike of the Kantian philosophy and of theories of natural science ; it is throughout interesting to read, and the author has evidently spent time and thought on the study of the subject. Whether the accomplishment of the aim which he has in view will be helped by the theological position to which he is bound by the Vatican Council, or by the particular moulds in which he has cast the certainly powerful 'cosmological' and 'teleological' argu-

ments, is a question to which differing answers will be given by different readers. It is true enough, logically, that the first step to belief is the certain acceptance of the existence of a personal God, and that consequently this must be the result of processes of natural reason. As a matter of fact, the steps to full and rational belief do not always follow a strictly logical order.

The Christian Doctrine of Sacerdotium as contained in the Scriptures and taught in our Formularies. Being a paper read at the Annual Meeting of the South-Eastern Clerical and Lay Church Alliance, held at Dover, June 2, 1897, together with Notes and Appendix bearing on various Replies to the Papal Bull *Apostolicæ Curæ*. By the Rev. N. DIMOCK, M.A. (London: Elliot Stock, 1897.)

THE courtesy and calmness and Christian spirit which Mr. Dimock shows in this pamphlet certainly entitle all he has to say to consideration, and demand grateful recognition from those who cannot agree with his conclusions. But, in noticing his arguments, we can only say that the attempt to prove that, while the Christian Church and the Church of England possess a true *sacerdotium*, that *sacerdotium* does not imply any Eucharistic Sacrifice in a real sense, and is to be sought simply in 'a ministry of reconciliation to tell of the finished work of Him who has borne our sins in His own body on the tree' (p. 34), and in personal nearness to God, is foredoomed to failure. Such a use of language only helps to confuse controversy; and if, as we do not for a moment suppose, it should be necessary to abandon the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, it would surely be better with it to give up the word *sacerdotium* as no longer rightly applicable to the ministry of the Christian Church. We reciprocate Mr. Dimock's wishes that controversies on this subject may promote truth and peace. We cannot pretend to sympathise with the argumentative position taken up in his pamphlet.

The Official Year Book of the Church of England, 1897. (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.)

THE importance and usefulness of this publication increase year by year; one turns to it naturally for trustworthy information about nearly every kind of Church work, and for accurate records of the offerings of Churchmen. There is only one thing to be said adversely to such a book, viz. that it publishes abroad the weakness as well as the strength of the Church's organization and finance, and so supplies a weapon for the hands of her opponents, as well as an instrument for the use of her supporters. It would be quite possible from this Year Book to show up the deficiencies of the Church as established in this country, for example, in the slow formation of new dioceses, or the inadequate incomes of the clergy, whereas the purpose of the returns made for this book is to trace the progress of the Church's work in spite of the difficulties of her position. There are many encouragements in the present volume: signs of steady advance are to be seen everywhere, unless it be in the number of candidates for Holy Orders; there were only 704 deacons ordained in 1895-6, and though the population is increasing rapidly, the

average number for 25 years is 711; and it is to be regretted that the total of voluntary contributions, amounting to $5\frac{3}{4}$ millions of money, is rather less than in 1894-5. Still, it is most gratifying to have returns from 98 per cent. of the Parochial clergy in the year ending Easter 1896, and to find that in three dioceses, viz. Chester, Newcastle, and St. Asaph, a return has been made from every parish. There is a steady increase in the number of Infant Baptisms (562,833) and Communicants (1,840,351), and the candidates for Confirmation have been this year 12,300 above the average of the past ten years (1886-95), numbering in all 228,002. It is also satisfactory to know that the net clerical incomes in the aggregate show a slight increase in 1896, due chiefly to the fact that the stipends of the Assistant Clergy are drawn less (by 40,000*l.*) than they were from the pockets of the incumbents, and more from other sources; still, the Incumbents pay out 268,392*l.* on this account, while other sources supply 360,740*l.* per annum. There has been, too, a steady increase in the amount contributed to Day and Sunday Schools. Why should the cost of these two kinds of school be grouped together under one head? It renders the figures valueless for the question of Voluntary schools, and the two expenditures may not be put together in Form IX. Home and Foreign Missions show a healthy improvement, being each some 7,000*l.* and more larger. The Hospital Sunday Fund in London still exhibits the striking fact that Churchmen contribute at least 75 per cent. of the whole amount, while in the provinces about 50 per cent. is the Church's share. In the Preface (p. vii), the indefatigable editor, Canon F. Burnside, warns us that 'it is possible to misrepresent the truth by attaching too much importance to statistical tests as evidencing the failure or success of the Church'; but, we must say, in those points which we have indicated, the figures can mislead no one as to what is being done; 'consistent and steady progress' is manifest to every one who will study this Year Book. One valuable feature should not be overlooked by the clergy, viz. the summary of recent Church literature (pp. 506-529), for it would supply a course of theological study to those who have not time to read longer reviews, and do not know what to buy or ask for. One improvement we venture to suggest to the editor, viz. that some portion of the Year Book should be given to coming events and fixtures, instead of its being wholly a record of past history; for, if this cannot be, the title would more reasonably become *The Official Year Book for 1896* (not 1897), especially as the statistical records are those of 1895, or until Easter 1896 at the latest. Even a calendar of Church fixtures for the current year would be better than nothing.

MR.
sibil
colle
Holy
whic
Puse
mon
us.
posed
'long
that
of ha
the y
'thos
whose
may a
' Ar
VOL